

THE
Critical History
OF THE
VERSIONS
OF THE
New Testament.

PART II.

By Father SIMON *of the* Oratory.

TOGETHER

With a Refutation of such Passages as seem Contrary to the
Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *ENGLAND*.

Licensed, November 22. 1689.

J. FRASER.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Tho. Newborough* at the Golden Ball, and *Tho. Bennet*
at the Half-Moon in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, 1692.

THE

Central Library

OF THE

VERSIONS

OF THE

New Testament

Part II

Part II

TOGETHER

With a Revision of their Passages as found in the
Greek and Latin Texts of the Bible

Edited by
J. B. R. S. R.

B. O. N. D. O. N.

Printed for the Westbury at the Golden Ball
at the Hall in St. J. St. J.

THE
TRANSLATOR
TO THE
READER.

THE great Learning and Abilities of the Author of this Treatise, are too well known to need any Commendation from a Preface; I shall not therefore engage in so superfluous an Undertaking: But as I shall forbear attempting any thing by way of Panegyrick, so I hope it will not look like Detraction, to examine his Opinions, where they appear singular and unsatisfactory. For we of the Church of England are not accustomed to resign our selves up to Authorities, without enquiring into the Grounds they stand upon. Now since his Design, as himself tells us (*Advers.*) is to fortifie the received Doctrines of the Church of Rome, as far as his Subject leads him, and to combat the Innovations of the Protestants; i. e. To prove the Lawfulness and Expediency of performing the Publick Service of the Church in an unknown Language; and that the Vulgar ought not to have the use of the Scriptures, without a prudential Dispensation. Since, I say, he is pleased to grow thus Controversial in his Critical Remarks, I shall produce the Reasons of his Assertion, and briefly endeavour to shew the insufficiency of them. But before I do this, I shall lay down his Concessions, because I foresee they will prove not unserviceable in the Dispute.

First, He acknowledges, That nothing is more plain than that the Old and New Testament were published in Languages that were Vulgar and universally known, and that the Apostles wrote in Greek, because that Tongue was most generally used in the Roman Empire. p. 1.

Secondly. He Grants, That upon the Conversion of the Italians and other Roman Colonies to the Christian Religion, (which was effected in the Apostles time) it was necessary to Translate the Bible into Latin, that the People might understand it; and that it was read in the

The Translator to the Reader.

Vulgar Tongue at their Religious Assemblies. That the *Syrians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, Persians, Armenians*, and in short, all other Nations that received the Gospel, took the same care for the common Instruction. p. 2.

Thirdly, He tells us that this Observation concerning the numerous Translations of the New Testament, reaches all the Offices of the Church, which were antiently performed in the Language of each particular Country. p. 3.

Now one would think it was pretty plain, that those Reasons which are urged for the first Delivery of the Scriptures in a known Language, are as strong for their continuance in the publick Use. Did not God design those Holy Writings for a Direction to the generality of Mankind? That we might have a fuller discovery of the way to Happiness than Nature taught us; that we might know the Will of God better, and be furnish'd with a perfect Rule of Faith and Manners; That our Understandings might be informed, our Hopes quickned, or our Fears awaken'd, according to the different State of our Souls? For these ends the Scriptures were given by Inspiration of God, viz. Because they are profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness, that the Man of God may be perfect, &c. 2 Tim. 3. 16, 17. Now I desire to know of this Author, whether the Understanding that which God requires of us, whether these Directions for Conduct, and helps to Devotion which the Scriptures contain, are not as necessary to the same as to the first Ages of Christianity? Are Men born now, with greater Capabilities and more virtuous Inclinations than formerly? If not, certainly they have as much need to be thoroughly acquainted with the Divine Revelation, as their Predecessors had 1600 years ago. Nay, in the first Century (in which St. Simon owns the Bible was Translated as far as the Conversions reached) Miracles were frequent, and most of the Bishops were Inspired. (Dodw. Dissert. in Iren. p. 122. &c.) so that one would think there was less need of a standing Revelation; yet then the Vulgar were freely permitted the use of the Scriptures, and exhorted to study them. Is it not therefore a piece of unreasonable Conduct to bar the People the ordinary means of Improvement, when those which are extraordinary, are withdrawn? and to deprive them of the assistance of those Inspired Books when they have most occasion to be conversant in them? The custom of the Church of Rome in this point is surprizingly different from the Primitive Usage; Let us therefore examine the Reasons our Author gives in defence of this great Alteration.

First. He alledges that the Force and Spirit of the Original cannot be so well preserved in these Modern and Barbarous Languages, which succeeded the Latin when the Goths, Vandals, and Germans overran the West. p. 4.

The Translator to the Reader.

It seems then if the Roman Empire had stood, we might have had the Liberty of understanding our Bible and our Prayers as well as ever; which is a sign it's not so dangerous a permission as some men would make it.

But Secondly, It's very likely upon Examination, that our Western Languages will be found as polite and Comprehensive, as those spoken in Armenia, Persia, Æthiopia, &c. into all which he grants the Scriptures were very early Translated, and that it was necessary so to do. p. 2.

Thirdly. Granting the clearness and majesty of the Style should be in some measure injured by a variety of Translations; does it follow that because the Unlearned can't receive the Scriptures with all the Circumstances of Advantage, therefore they ought wholly to be forbid the use of them? What are the People the better for the Original, if they must not be permitted to understand it? If it's said they must learn the Meaning of the Scriptures from their Spiritual Guides: To this I Answer,

First, That their Guides can give them no Assistance without Translating the Text; so that of necessity we must come to our Mother-Tongue at last. And since a Translation is necessary to inform the Vulgar, I desire to know whether it's not as likely to be performed successfully when it's undertaken in the whole, and made a distinct and particular Employment, as when it's accidentally expounded in parts, by way of Sermon and Catechetical Discourse? Besides, this Objection reflects upon those Modern Versions which are allowed to some Persons in the Church of Rome; Nay, the so much magnify'd VULGAR must not escape, unless our Author can prove that it's impossible for any of our European Languages to reach the Sense of the Original so well, as that Latin Translation has done; which I believe is no easy task to make out. To proceed.

Our Authors Second Reason why the Scriptures and Liturgy ought not to be continued in the Vulgar Tongue, is, it seems, to avoid singularity. For He tells us, p. 6. and 8. That the Church of Rome does nothing in this point but what is practised in the Greek, Eastern and African Churches, where the ancient Translations of the Bible are still retained in their Liturgy, notwithstanding the alteration of their Language has made them unintelligible to the People. 'Tis true, the Greeks have it in the Original, but it's so different from that which is now their Mother-Tongue, that the Modern Grecians understand it little better than if it was foreign. I wonder he did not bring the Heathens into his Catalogue to compleat the Authority; as Cardinal Perron has done upon this Argument. (Replique a La Response Du Roy, &c. p. 930.) Now allowing the Truth of his Instance (which I am not at leisure to examine) I can't imagine what Service it can do him.

For first, General Consent is not sufficient to make a Custom reasonable without the Concurrence of other Arguments. Numbers without Weight are very
b *illogical*

The Translator to the Reader.

illogical things. I conceive our Author himself upon consideration, would count it but an odd way to go always to the Poll for right and wrong.

Secondly, It's somewhat strange to find him justify the practice of his own Communion, by its Agreement with the Eastern, Greek, and African Churches. For are these Churches always in the right? then most certainly that of Rome is mistaken. One would have thought it had been no matter how such Hereticks and Schismatics manage their Devotion, or what Opinion they are of. They all agree in rejecting the Popes Supremacy, and several other Doctrines of the Latin Church, in which P. Simon doubtless is not of their mind. And if their Authority is weak and insignificant in some points, why ought it to be taken upon Content in others, without any Collateral Evidence to support it?

But Thirdly, Our Author urges that the promiscuous Use of the Scriptures is apt to occasion Divisions, and Fanaticism, witness the Protestants. For now the People have not that Veneration for the Traditions of the Church, nor that Regard for their Bishops which they had in the Primitive Times, and therefore they ought to be differently Govern'd: p. 8. 536.

To this I Answer,

First, That Granting his Objection to be true, yet it's more desirous to be divided about lighter matters, than to agree in great and dangerous Errors. Now we affirm this to be the case between the Church of Rome and Us; and therefore this Accusation ought to have been waved till he had proved the reasonableness of the Terms of Agreement in his own Communion, and the malignity of those Divisions which are in Ours.

Secondly, He is too severe (not to say uncandid) in asserting that the free Use of the Scriptures has made the Protestants Fanatical, when the Papists can be so without it. Now that the Charge of Fanaticism, both in respect of the Enthusiastick, and Rebellious part of that Notion, may be justly objected to the Church of Rome, has been sufficiently made out by Dr. Stillingsfleet. (Idol. of the Church of Rome, Chap. 4.)

Thirdly, The Argument our Author makes use of against the Protestants, is perfectly Fanatical. The People must not be allowed the Scriptures because they sometimes wrest them to their Disadvantage; That is, the use of a Thing not only Innocent but Excellent in it self must be laid aside because it's liable to be abus'd. If this be not Fanatical Reasoning, I would gladly know what is: He might as well have argued against the danger of Eating and Drinking, because some Intemperate Persons surfeit by it.

Fourthly, The same reasons which are now alledged to bar the People the Liberty of the Scriptures, will equally hold against the first publication of them. For whatever this Author may imagine, the People had not then so great a Veneration

The Translator to the Reader.

re veneration for the Tradition of the Church, or the Authority of their Bishops, as to be proof against being perverted; witness that swarm of pestilent Heresies which sprung up in little more than the first Century; yet the prospect and actual appearance of these unhappy Divisions, were not thought sufficient Reasons, either by the Holy Ghost, or the Apostolical Governors of the Church, to lock up the Scriptures in a Sacred and peculiar Character, But they were both Published, and Translated in those Languages which were Vulgar and General. And the People were so far from being restrained the freedom of perusing them, that on the contrary they were instructed to make them their constant Study and Meditation: All which is acknowledged by our Author himself. P. 1, 2. 536.

Fifthly, Most of the Heresies have been propagated by persons of Capacity and Figure in the Church; and therefore by consequence of this Argument, the Learned ought to be prohibited the Scriptures, rather than the Vulgar; because the former have generally more Ambition and greater Skill to do Harm, than the latter.

In his Second Chapter he urges some farther Reasons for the use of the Scriptures, and publick Prayers in an unknown Language.

First, He argues, that the Jews read the Old Testament in their Synagogues in the Hebrew Language, which the People could not understand, which practice of theirs was uncensured by our Saviour. To this I Answer,

First, That our Saviour might reprove the Jews for this custom for ought we know, notwithstanding his Censure is not recorded by any of the Evangelists. For St. Paul mentions one memorable Sentence of our Saviour's, Acts 20. 35. And the Fathers some others, which none of the Gospels take notice of. And since, as St. John affirms, Joh. 21. 25. That many of our Saviour's Miracles were unrelated in the History of his Life, we may reasonably conclude, that no small part of his Instructions were likewise omitted. This is certain, that there were several Errors in the Jewish Church, which we don't find particularly reprov'd by our Saviour. To give an Instance or two, We know the Sadduces were very much in the wrong, about the number of the Inspired Writings, and contracted that Canon to the Five Books of Moses. But notwithstanding the several Disputes and Contests our Saviour and his Apostles had with this Sect, we have no written proof, that this great mistake of theirs was censured either by the one or the other.

Farther, Though our Saviour reprov'd the Pharisees with so much plainness for their corrupt Traditions; Yet this was done only occasionally and in general, without any design of confuting them one by one; as appears

The Translator to the Reader.

appears from St. Matth. 7. 11, 13. where after his reproof of the Pharisees for their weakning the force of the 5th Commandment, under pretence of a View, and that they had made the word of God of none effect, through their Traditions; He adds, And many such like things do ye: which is an Argument that many of their Superstitions and unreasonable Opinions were usually comprehended under a general reprehension. In like manner St. Matt. 23. 23. He charges them with the omission of the weightier parts of the Law, Judgment, Mercy and Justice; and that their Innovation upon the Religion of their Ancestors had made them Strain at a Gnat, and swallow a Camel; But we have no reason to believe the whole System of their Orall Traditions, and all their perverse Interpretations of the Law, were reckoned up either in this Chapter or in any other part of the Evangelical History. The consequence of these Observations is, That the Jews might be very much to blame for reading their Law in Hebrew, when the People did not understand it, though we don't find them censured by our Saviour for so doing.

Secondly, The Jewish Doctors used to Interpret that portion of Scripture to the People, which was read in their Synagogues, as might be abundantly made out, if it were not granted by our Author himself, p. 12. Now this is more than is done by the Church of Rome.

Thirdly, Doctor Lightfoot observes from the Rabby, That one or two of the publick Synagogal Prayers were penned in the Mother Tongue, particularly that after Sermon, because the common people were then present, therefore this Prayer was compos'd in Chaldee, that all might understand it. Lightfoot, Helr. and Talmud. Exer. upon 1 Cor. 14. p. 784. Besides, as our Author acknowledges those Prayers which were made in Hebrew, were always Interpreted to the People in the Vulgar Language. Now these are two Advantages, or to speak properly, Exonuations, which the Church of Rome cannot challenge in defence of her Worship.

His Second Argument is, That the First Christians called Nazarenes who were converted from the Jewish Church, read the Law and the Prophets in Hebrew. For the proof of this he refers us to the First Part of his Critical History upon the New Testament. c. 7. p. 51. From whence he concludes, That the Protestants who boast as if they follow'd the antient practice of the Church, will be oblig'd to confess, that the First or Eldest Antiquity is against them. To this I Answer,

First, That Granting the Nazarene Christians did read the Bible in Hebrew at their Assemblies, this only proves that they retained somewhat of the Opiniative Spirit of their Countrymen, after their Conversion; that they were tenacious of their old Customs, though never so singular. For
that

The Translator to the Reader.

that the rest of Christendom dissented from them in this point, is acknowledged by P. Simon. Now the Question is Whether the Authority of those Jewish Converts is sufficient of it self to weigh against the contrary, and general practice of the Primitive Church? And to bear down all other Arguments which may be alledged against it? If that Authority is thus Sacred and Infallible, Why is it not universally follow'd? These Christians observed all the Mosaick Ceremonies, and therefore if their example be so irrefragable, the Church of Rome must be to blame for not imitating them.

Secondly, The matter of Fact is not cleared by our Author; for St Epiphanius, whom he cites for his Opinion, says no more than that the Nazarens were descended from the Christians who retired from Jerusalem to Pella; that they received the Jewish Canon, and held like Jews in all other points save only their belief in Jesus Christ. *ὡς Ἰουδαῖοι πάντα νόμους ἐμύλεγον*, &c. (which words our Author Translates with a Turn of Advantage) Epiph. Har. 29. N. 7.

Now what binders but that these Christians might hold the same points of Doctrine with the Jews, excepting what related to our Saviour, and yet use their Bible at the publick Worship in the Vulgar Tongue? Difference in Language is not sufficient to make a different Belief. As long as the Things and Opinions are the same, the variety in Sounds is not material. The Greek and Latin Christians were but one Church before the Filioq; and yet they read the Scriptures in different Languages. In like manner the Jews and first Converts may be said to agree in the Canon and Doctrine of the Old Testament; though they did not hear of them read Hebrew at their Religious Assemblies.

Farther, St. Epiphanius tells us, that these Nazarens understood the Hebrew Tongue exactly; which if true, overthrows the design of our Author's Citation.

Thirdly, By Father Simons Confession these Primo-Primitive Christians of Jerusalem used the New Testament in the Vulgar Tongue; for he has proved with a great deal of Learning and strength, that St. Matthew wrote Originally in Chaldee, though with Hebrew Characters; that he intended his Gospel for the use of the Christians of Jerusalem and Palestine; and that the Chaldee was the Native Language of that Country. And upon this last Reason, he informs us, that all the Antients founded their Opinions of St. Matthew's writing in Hebrew: Concluding, I suppose, that it could not have been so beneficial to the Christians of Judea if it had been written in a Foreign Language. 1. part. Crit. Hist. New Test. cap. 5, 6, 7. So that by our Authors argument we see the Apostles first Converts had the New Testament, that is, the much greater part of their Religion in the Vulgar Tongue; and consequently that the most remote Antiquity stands on the Protestants side.

Lastly,

The Translator to the Reader.

Lastly, He attempts to answer what is Objected from 1 Cor. 14. against the use of an unknown Language in the Liturgy of the Church, where he offers to prove that the Apostle does not forbid the use of Foreign Languages in the Church, but only prescribes a Rule for the due management of them. p. 11. 14.

In replying to this I shall briefly endeavour to prove these three things.

First, That St. Paul shews a general Dislike of a strange Language in the Service of the Church.

Secondly, That there were particular Reasons for the permission of Foreign Languages in the Apostles times, which don't reach the later Ages of Christianity.

Thirdly, That P. Simon's Explication of the Apostles sense, though allowed, is not sufficient to justify his own Communion.

First, St. Paul shews a general Dislike of the use of a strange Language in the Service of the Church, and appeals as it were to Common Sense against it. To cite all the places to this purpose would be to Transcribe the greatest part of this 14th Chapter. I shall only mention some of them.

In 2, 5. Verses, the Apostle tells us, That he that speaks in an Unknown Tongue, speaks not to Men but to God, that he Edifies (only) himself, & the Church receives no advantage by such Practices. And v. 13. He says, Except ye utter by the Tongue things easie to be understood, ye shall speak into the Air; and v. 14. If I know not the meaning of the Voice I shall be unto him that speaks a Barbarian, and he that speaks will be a Barbarian unto me: So that in the Apostles sense we do but throw away our words, Talk to no purpose, and lose the Benefit of Speech when we don't express our thoughts in intelligible Language. And if this be improper and absurd in common Conversation, it must be much more so in Religious Assemblies, where, if any where, the use of Speech ought to be rational and instructive.

Farther, v. 18, 19. He continues that He spoke with Tongues more than all of them; and yet professeth that he had rather speak five words which were generally understood, than 10000 in an unknown Tongue. And though the Church of Rome seems to think otherwise; yet the reason of the Apostles Judgment is very obvious: For how can the Understanding be informed, the Affections warmed and excited, and Attention kept up, when a Man is unacquainted with his Devotions: and for ought he knows the Priest may be saying a Charm instead of a Prayer.

Secondly, There were particular Reasons for the permission of Foreign Languages in the Apostles times, which don't reach the later Ages of Christianity.

The Translator to the Reader.

fluently. That the Gift of Tongues was one of the Miraculous Effusions of the Holy Ghost is beyond dispute: And being an Argument of a Divine presence, it was proper to make use of them sometimes in the Church, to conciliate a greater regard to what they delivered in their Interpretations; and especially to convince the Jews and Gentiles that their Mission and Doctrine was from Heaven. Accordingly we may observe, Acts 2. that the Apostles speaking in variety of unstudied Languages had a mighty Influence upon those who heard them; and without doubt made St. Peters Sermon more operative upon their Minds: And therefore St. Paul affirms v. 22. That Tongues are a sign not to them that believe, but to them that believe not. But those who neither converse with Infidels, nor pretend to Inspiration, have none of these Apostolical Reasons to justify their use of an unknown Language. For to hear a Man say his Prayers in Latin, when all the Congregation knows his skill is the effect of Study and Education, will raise the character of his Sanctity very little: and is a sign of nothing more than that for some reasons he has no mind to be understood.

Thirdly, Admitting P. Simon's Explication to be Orthodox and full, this is not sufficient to justify his own Communion. He tells us, St. Paul did not blame the Corinthians for Speaking or Praying in a strange Language; But because they did not Translate their Sense so as to make themselves intelligible to the Congregation, p. 13. And by way of Paraphrase upon v. 17. (Thou givest Thanks well, but the other is not edified) He affirms that the Apostle urges the Observation of the Custom among the Jews, i. e. not to read the Scripture or the Liturgy, without the assistance of an Interpreter. For otherwise he grants the Apostles Exhortation takes place; How shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen, at thy giving of Thanks? p. 12. Now these Concessions, as has been already observed, condemn the practice of his own Church. For though construing of Prayers, when nothing miraculous is pretended, is but an odd sort of an employment, yet this is more than is done in the Church of Rome. Indeed he is pleased to say, that according to the design of this 14th Chapter, every thing which relates to the Instruction of the Congregation, is by the Romanists spoken in a Language understood by all. Now one would think by this Assertion, the whole Service was Translated line by line; But upon examination we shall find, that nothing but their Sermons are delivered in the Vulgar Tongue. So that it seems it's not material in our Author's Opinion, whether the People understand their Prayers or not: though afterwards he Grants they cannot say Amen, without being better informed. Cardinal Person found himself very much embarrassed with this difficulty and endeavours to disengage his Church, by saying that their Prayers and Sermons, and Printed Discourses were sufficient to acquaint the People with the meaning of their Devotions. Replique, &c. 933. But afterwards finding this Defence too weak, he does as good as give it up. And advances several Reasons to prove the Expediency of promoting Ignorance, and keeping the

The Translator to the Reader.

the Scriptures, and publick Prayers in a Language not vulgarly understood. 256.

To sum up all; Since the Protestants have the concurrence of Reason, Revelation and Antiquity, to justify their use of the Scriptures and Liturgy in the Vulgar Tongue; They need not be solicitous about the Determinations of Modern Popes and Councils, about the Censure of the Faculty of Paris, or the Rule of the Index; though produced with never so much Pomp and Solemnity. p. 536, 537. These Authorities when they contradict the former, signifie little. For however they may abound in numbers, we are sure they have not weight enough to govern our practice.

These short Animadversions, are, I conceive, sufficient to make the Author harmless and inoffensive to the English Reader. Those who have a mind to see the point disputed more at large, may, if they please, consult the Tracts lately written upon this Argument.

THE

A

CRITICAL HISTORY

Of the Versions of the

New Testament.

V O L. II.

Shewing the different Customs in Reading the
Holy Scriptures in the Principal Churches
of the World.

C H A P. I.

Concerning the Versions of the New Testament in general in the chief Churches of the World: The Conformity of the Eastern and Western Churches: The Protestants in this point are of a different Opinion from other Christian Societies: Reflections upon the whole matter.

I Shall not spend time in proving that the Books of the New Testament were delivered to the Primitive Christians in the Language that was then generally understood by the People, because it is a Truth sufficiently apparent, and cannot be denied but by those that are altogether ignorant of this matter: As *Moses* wrote the Law in *Hebrew*, which was the Language of the Ancient *Israelites*; after the same manner the Apostles in Preaching the Gospel

pel of *Jesus Christ* made use of the *Greek Tongue*, which was at that time the most Universal in the Empire: And whereas *St. Matthew* composed his Gospel in *Hebrew* or *Chaldaic*, he did it on no other account, but because he was the Apostle of the *Jews of Jerusalem*, and thought it convenient to Discourse to them in the Language that was used in their Synagogues.

Italy having embraced the Christian Religion in the time of the Apostles, which was afterwards by degrees communicated to other Provinces where the *Roman Colonies* had transported the *Latin Tongue*; it became necessary to Translate the Bible into *Latin*, that it might be perused by those People, and that it might be read in the publick Assemblies in their own native Language: The same hath been done for the benefit of the *Syrians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, Persians, Armenians*, and in a word, of all Nations in the World that received the Gospel of *Jesus Christ* in the first Ages of Christianity: The Fathers do sometimes make mention of these Ancient Translations of the New Testament that have been made for the use of these People, part whereof only remains extant at this day.

What we have now Remark'd relating to the Books of the New Testament extends in general to all the Offices of Divine Service that were repeated in the Churches, and were compiled in those times in the Language of every particular Country. Cardinal *Bona* hath judiciously observed this in his Work concerning Liturgies, wherein he examines in what Language the Apostles celebrated Mass; he also confutes *John Echius*, who presumed to affirm that the Apostles and their Successors pronounced the Liturgie in *Hebrew* until the time of the Emperor *Adrian*; he insists on the contrary (a) that the Apostles received from the Holy Ghost the gift of Tongues for no other end but to promulge the Mysteries of the Christian Religion to all the Nations of the World in their proper Languages, and by no means in those that were foreign or unknown, especially the *Hebrew*, that was then understood by none, not even by the common sort of People of the *Jews*.

P. Amel. Therefore the difference that Father *Amelote* of the Oratory makes
Pref. de between the reading of the Bible, and that of the Liturgy in those
fa Verf. Primitive times of the Church, can have no other grounds but his ima-
du N. T. gination; both one and the other were written in the vulgar Lan-
guage, wherein the Office of the Church equally consisted: Altho it
were true that part of the Liturgy was then read with a low Voice,
nevertheless this doth not refer to the matter in Dispute, since it is

(a) *Apostoli donum linguarum a Spiritu Sancto acceperant, ut fidem ejusque mysteria singulis gentibus proprio cujusque idioma prædicarent. Et docerent, non exorico, & præsertim Hebræo, quod tum temporis nec vulgo quidem Hebræorum notum erat. Bon. lib. 1. ser. Liturg. c. 5.*

certain

certain that the People were concerned in a part of this Service, who repeated it aloud. The Liturgy is a publick Action in which all the Faithful have an interest, who make but one Body with the Priest that presides over them, and is the principal Minister: This is the Doctrin of St. *John Chrysostom*, who in this point distinguisheth the Christians of the New Testament, from the People under the Jewish Dispensation; in regard that the former pronounce with the Priest part of the Prayers that are made in the Sacrifice, as having really a share therein. (b) *The Priest* (saith this learned Bishop) *Prays for the People in these most Holy Mysteries, and the People Pray for the Priest.* — *The Priest doth not give thanks alone, but all the People together with him.*

Neither can I apprehend the reason alledged by the said Father *Amelore* in the same place to prove this difference between the Bible and the Liturgy: *The Bible* (saith he) *hath passed from the Jews to all the Nations of the World, but not their Rituals and Ceremonials.* A strange sort of Arguing! It would follow from thence that the Christians had joyned Judaism with Christianity: For Rituals are appropriated to each Religion, and they could not consequently be transmitted from the Jews to the Christians: The occasion that reduced the said Father to these extremities was this, The French Version and the Roman Missal made by M. *Voisin* was condemned in the general Assembly of the Clergy; thereupon Father *Amelore* fearing lest the Translation of the New Testament that he intended to Publish, should be also included in this censure, invented Arguments to make a distinction between the Text of the Bible and that of the Liturgy: But the Bishops of this Assembly that equally prohibited the use of the Bible and the Liturgy in the vulgar Tongue, ought to have made him sensible that his Reasons were imaginary, and that he acted in this matter with little Sincerity. Indeed it is not to be doubted but the Books of the New Testament and the Missals were written in the first Ages of Christianity in the vulgar Languages, that they might be intelligible to all the World; but the Scene of Affairs being changed in process of time; an alteration was introduced in the manner of reading the sacred Books and the Liturgies; for when the Empire was almost totally ruined by the continual Incurfions of the Barbarous Nations that made themselves Masters thereof, it happened that the Languages into which the Holy Scriptures had been Translated, were no longer understood by the People, who nevertheless in the publick Service forbore not to make use of their Ancient Versions.

(b) Ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν φερουσέων μυστηρίων ἐπύχεται ἱερὸς τῶ λαῶ. ἐπύχεται καὶ ὁ λαὸς τῶ ἱεροῦ — εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐκείνη εὐχαριστῇ μόνῃ. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ λαὸς αὐτῶν.
Joann. Chrys. Hom. 18. in Epist. II. ad Cor.

The greatest part of the Christian Societies imitated the example of the *Jews*, who at their return from the *Babylonish* Captivity, forgot the sacred Language, however they continued to read in their Assemblies the Law of *Moses* in *Hebrew*, and had recourse to Interpreters; which gave occasion to the *Chaldaic* Paraphrase in the Territory of *Jerusalem* for the use of the *Jews* that spake in the *Chaldaic* or *Syriac* Tongue: They also Translated the sacred Volumes into *Greek* for the Instruction of those of their Nation that Inhabited in the Countries where *Alexander* and his Successors had spread abroad that Language; but after all, they had ever a great respect for the Originals of the Bible, persisting to read them publicly in their Synagogues, altho they were no longer understood by the common People: They still preserve this Ancient Custom to this day in all the parts of the World wheresoever they are dispersed.

The Christians who at the beginning of their Religion had enjoyed the benefit of the Versions of the New Testament in their own Languages, and had read them in their Churches, continued also to read them afterwards when they did not understand them: They had the same veneration for their first Translations of the Bible, as the *Jews* have for the sacred Originals, because they received them together with their Religion. To this cause ought to be attributed the perfect Uniformity in all the Western Catholick Churches in publicly reading the Holy Scriptures in the *Latin* Tongue, which hath been unknown to the People for many Ages. The Church of *Rome* that agrees, as to this particular, with the Eastern Churches, hath had very good reasons to preserve their Ancient Version for the publick use: The Barbarous Languages that have taken the place of the *Latin* throughout all the Western Countries, were Imperfect, Defective and Obnoxious to very great alterations; and it was not possible to Translate the Bible into such Languages so accurately and with the same efficacy as it hath been into *Latin*, wherefore all the Western people have esteemed the *Latin* Interpretation as a true Original. This hath obliged Cardinal *Bona* to declare, That (c) the Church hath most wisely Ordained that Divine Offices should be Celebrated in the Language in which they were first Written, tho it were unknown to the People.

There is nothing more Extravagant than that which *Peter du Moulin* hath Written on this Subject against Cardinal *du Perron*, in a little Book Entituled *Anti-Barbarus*, The end (saith this Minister) that the Pope hath proposed to himself in Establishing the *Latin* Tongue in the publick Service, is to set up amongst the Nations that he hath Subdued, the Marks and Trophies of his Empire. As if the Popes were the cause that

(c) Sapiientissime ab Ecclesia constitutum est, ut quo idiomate missæ primum instituta sunt, ea semper celebrentur, licet ignotum sit. Eon. Ibid.

the *Latin Tongue* hath prevailed throughout all the Western Countries; he might as well have avouched by the same reason, that the Patriarchs of the different Christian Societies in the East design'd to set up amongst the Nations that are subject to them, the *Marks and Trophies of their Empire*, by retaining in the publick Service those Languages that they do not understand. Can it be imagined that the Patriarchs of the *Syrians* that consist of several Sects, have appointed the publick Service to be Celebrated in the *Syriac Tongue*, on purpose to Establish their Empire over the Christians that are under their Jurisdiction? He ought also to argue after the same manner with respect to the *Cophitics*, the *Ethiopians*, the *Armenians*, and in a word, all the other Sects that are to be found in the Eastern Churches, because they have likewise preserved their Ancient Language in their Offices.

Moreover, to begin with the *Syrians*, it is certain that tho they are distributed into *Nestorians*, *Jacobites* and *Maronites*; yet they all read the New Testament, and even all the Holy Scriptures in the *Syriac Tongue*, whereof the People are ignorant: It is true indeed that these Sects, besides their Versions written in *Syriac*, which is their ancient Language, have also *Arabic* Translations as well of the Old as of the New Testament, that are allowed to be read by the Commonalty. There are extant certain *Syriac* M SS. Copies of the New Testament, to which the *Arabic* is joyned, but these *Arabic* Interpretations are not read in the publick Service; there are also some *Cophitic* that have *Arabic* Translations of the Bible annexed to them: Furthermore there are in the King's Library some M SS. Books that have been used by the *Cophitics*, wherein the *Cophitic* is written on one side, and the *Arabic* on the other; as there are in like manner found divers M SS. Copies of the New Testament divided into two Columns, containing *Syriac* in one, and *Arabic* in the other: However this *Cophitic* and this *Syriac* are constantly read in the publick Offices, altho they are no longer understood, not only by the People, but by the most part of the Priests.

The same thing may be affirmed touching the *Arabic*, with respect to those Nations, as of the Vulgar Translations in the Western Churches; for as it was never intended in Translating the Bible out of *Latin* into *French*, *Italian*, *Spanish*, *German*, or any other modern Tongue, to Introduce these Versions into our Churches, but only to Edify the People: So the Christians of the Eastern Church have made *Arabic* Interpretations only for their particular Instruction; but have always retained in the publick Service their Ancient Translations; in which they perfectly agree with the Church of *Rome*, that hath also several Versions in all sorts of Languages. We ought to argue after the same manner concerning the *Ethiopians* and *Armenians*; for tho these Nations do at this day speak *Ethiopic* and *Armenian*, and their Bibles are written in these Languages; nevertheless it is an Old *Ethi-*
opic

Ludolf.
Hist.
Æth. lib.
I. C. 15.

opic and an Old *Armenian*, that is not now understood by the People. M. *Ludolf*, a zealous *Lutheran* who hath omitted nothing that may tend to Adjust the *Ethiopian Creed* with the Confession of *Ansbourg*, confesseth that they have preserved the Ancient *Ethiopic Tongue* in their Books, and in the Rituals of their Church *in Libris & in Cultu Sacro*.

The *Grecians* themselves who have always read the Bible in *Greek*, have not spoke in their Ancient Tongue for some Ages, nevertheless they have not to this present time made any Versions of the Holy Scriptures in their Vulgar *Greek*: The New Testament Printed in this Language at *Geneva*, is a Work of certain *Grecians* that were Friends of the *Calvinists*, and was not undertaken but at the Solicitation of the Estates at the Port. There is no part of the Ancient Bible written in the *Persian Tongue*, mentioned by the Fathers, now remaining; for the *Persian Version* of the New Testament, Printed in the Polyglott Bible of *England*, is of a later Date, and was made from the *Syriac Translation*.

I should have nothing to object against the proceedings of the Protestants, who have published a great number of Versions of the Holy Scriptures in the Vulgar Languages, if they had imitated the Christian Societies in the East, or rather the *Latin Church*, from which they have unadvisedly separated themselves: It is certain that before the Name of *Protestants* was known in the World, the Bible was Translated into *French*, *Spanish*, *High-Dutch*, *Italian*, and even before those times into Old *French*, that was the *German Language*, and into Old *Saxon*: There are extant in the King's Library many *French MSS. Bibles*, that have belonged to our Kings, and to the most Eminent Lords of their Court: Moreover there is found therein a *Latin and French Copy* of the whole Bible that was written for the use of a Duke of *Burgundy*; there is also in this Library an entire *MSS. Bible* in the *Catalonian Tongue*; and what is most remarkable there to be seen, is one and the same *French Bible* which hath been written in various Dialects according to the different Languages of those that Transcribed it; a *Picard*, for example, hath caused it to speak in the Idiom of *Picardy*, &c.

The Protestants therefore do vainly boast that they have Revealed the H. Scriptures to the Vulgar more particularly than they were formerly; it may be averred on the contrary, that the Fanaticism that this reading hath produced in the minds of divers persons since the Original of Protestancy, hath obliged some Popes and Bishops not to permit it indifferently to all sorts of People. If Bibles are become more common in these later times, this happens because before the Art of Printing was invented, very few could bear the charge that was necessary to purchase Manuscript Books, and we see at present that Bibles are scarce enough in those places where they are Written with the Hand; this constrained the *Armenians*, not many years ago, to send one

one of their Bishops into *Europe* to procure their *Armenian* Bible, and some other Books, to be Printed there.

The Protestants ought to have been content with Revising the Versions in the Vulgar Tongue that were extant before their time in all the Churches of *Europe*; but if they thought it convenient to cast them into a new Mold to render them more exact, they might have done it, provided they had no other regard but to the private Instruction of the Ignorant People; for it was not Lawful to Introduce them into the publick Assemblies, contrary to the Custom generally received in all the other Churches of the World. No Sects before them that withdrew themselves from the Body of the Church, at least in the Eastern Countries, ever took the Liberty to make new Translations of the H. Scriptures, with a design more firmly to support their Belief; but have inviolably preserved their Ancient Versions, without considering that they were no longer understood by the People: If they have made any new, they did it not with an intent to put them in the room of the Old. To prove this, we need only to cast our Eyes on the *Macedonians*, the *Nestoreans*, and other Hereticks that have been in the *Greek* Church; we shall find that none of them have thought it requisite for Authorizing the Novelty of their Opinions, to make or to chuse particular Translations of the Bible; they have all followed, as to the Old Testament, the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint; which was established in the Church that they abandoned. The *Nestoreans*, and the *Jacobites* of the *Syrian* Nation, have not composed new Translations of the H. Scriptures that they might oppose them to the Orthodox. From all these Observations it is apparent that there is nothing more ill grounded than the Complaints of the Protestants on this account against the Church of *Rome*, since she is not singular in this point, but acts according to the common Practice of all the Christian Societies of the *Levant*; therefore it is a great piece of Folly in them to Condemn a Custom that is generally observed throughout the whole World. *Hoc quin ita faciendum sit*, (said St. *Austine* heretofore) *disputare, insolentissima insania est.*

Aug.
Epist.
118.

Ludovicus Cappellus who perceived the force of this Objection, and was otherwise perswaded that the Peace of the Church ought not to be disturbed for matters of pure Discipline, alledges (*d*) that St. *Austine* doth only Discourse in that place of things that are commendable, or at least indifferent, and not concerning those that are contrary to Reason. But can it be imagined that of all the Churches, as well Eastern as Western, the Protestant party alone, follow the

ad Janu-
nuar.

(d) Id Augustini dictum accipiendum est de usibus qui sunt de rebus vel laudabilibus, vel saltem adiaphoribus, non de illis qui sunt contra rationem, ut est mos iste Pontificiorum perversissimus. Lud. Capp. th. 30. de Liturg. & ling. igni in sac. usu.

Dictates of sound Reason, and that all other Christians evidently contradict it? However they attribute a Practice wholly to the *Roman Catholics* that is Religiously observed by their greatest Enemies.

We ought then to distinguish the Languages that the People spoke when they received the Gospel of Jesus Christ, from others that were used a great while after. The objections that the Protestants raise against the Catholics, to shew by Examples taken from Antiquity, that the H. Scriptures ought publickly to be read in a Dialect understood by all the People, relate to the Primitive Times, and to these Original Languages; we agree with them, that the *Grecians*, the *Latins*, the *Syrians*, the *Egyptians*, the *Ethiopians*, the *Armenians*, and generally all the Christians, in the beginning, read the Bible in a known Tongue: If the *Latin* were yet Predomiant in the Western Countries, there would be no cause of Dispute thereupon with the Protestants; but the Barbarous Nations (as hath been already Remark'd) having given occasion to a great diversity of Languages; the Western Churches have very prudently retained the Ancient Tongue of the Empire in the Publick Service; the Eastern Churches have also done the same thing with respect to their Ancient Translations, which they esteem, in a manner, as the Originals of the Word of God, because they were written in those Languages that were spoken by them when they first Embraced the Christian Religion; to which it may be added, that People do not easily Abrogate their Ancient Customs, especially in an Affair that relates to a Reading, that hath been publickly Authorized for many Ages.

C H A P. II.

An Explication of the Words of St. Paul in the 14th Chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians: The Primitive Christians were permitted to speak in their Assemblies in a Foreign Language: Their Custom in reading the Holy Scriptures and the Liturgies: Reflections on the Practice of the Catholick Churches before the Appearing of the Protestants: That there were several Bibles in the Vulgar Tongue, as well MSS. as Printed Copies before those times.

OU R Saviour Jesus Christ who hath freely Reproved the false Traditions of the *Pharisees*, never Rebuked them because they Read in the Temple and in the Synagogues the Law of *Moses* and the Prophets in the Ancient *Hebrew* Tongue, which was not understood

stood by the People. The Primitive Christians of *Jerusalem* that were Descended from the *Jews*, continued this Custom in their Assemblies, wherein they also read the Law and the Prophets in *Hebrew*, as hath been prov'd in the first part of this Critical History, where mention hath been made of the *Nazareans*: If then we take for our rule the ancient practice of the Christians in reading the sacred Writings, we shall not account it strange that these Books are read at this day in the chief Churches of the World in those Languages that are now disused and unknown to the Vulgar; and the Protestants who boast that they have Antiquity on their side, will be compelled to acknowledge that the most Primitive Antiquity doth not favour them.

The most considerable Arguments that are produced by them against the Catholics, to maintain their opinion, consist in these words of St. Paul, *Except ye utter by the Tongue, words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? For ye shall speak into the Air. — If I know not the meaning of the Voice, I shall be to him that speaketh a Barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a Barbarian unto me.* St. Paul (say they) in this place manifestly reprehends those that speak in the Congregation in an unknown Tongue, whereas their Brethren were ignorant; but it may be easily proved by this same passage, that the Primitive Christians imitated the *Jews* in speaking foreign Languages in their Assemblies, which were not understood by all their Brethren: The whole Discourse of the Apostle in the 14th Chap. of his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, tends only to shew, that nothing ought to be pronounced in the publick Assemblies for the Instruction of the People but what was plain and intelligible to all the World; this is observ'd in the Church of *Rome*, as well as in all other Christian Societies. Forasmuch as the first Assemblies of the Christians were composed of persons that spoke different Languages; and since there were many *Jews* in that of *Corinth* that spake *Chaldaic* or *Syriac*, St. Paul excludes none: On the contrary he permits them to Discourse there in a foreign Tongue, provided they make use of an Interpreter; according to the custom received at that time in the Synagogues. *For greater is he that Prophesieth (saith he) than he that speaketh with Tongues, except he interpret, that the Church may receive Edifying.*

Epist. 1.
ad Cor. c.
14. v. 9.
& 11.

Ibid. v. 5.

The Apostle then doth not forbid the People the use of unknown Tongues, in case the interpretation were added. Thus much may be gathered from his own Words, which intimate, that some might compose Prayers in a Language that was not understood by others, upon this condition, that there should be an Interpreter present to explain them, that the Congregation might say *Amen* at the end of the Prayer. Moreover he approves this Prayer in a foreign Tongue, and only affirms that others are not Edified by it. *For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not Edified.* He insists on the custom that was then practised amongst the *Jews*, not to repeat the words of the

Ibid. v. 17.

H. Scriptures, nor the Common Prayers of the Liturgy without the
 Ibid. v. 16. assistance of an Interpreter : The following expression of St. Paul
 ought to be Expounded in this sense ; *Else when thou shalt bless with the
 Spirit, [in an unknown Tongue] how shall he that occupieth the room of
 the unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not
 what thou sayest ?*

The Jews do still at this very day call their Prayers *Benedictions* and
giving of Thanks, as may be seen in their Rituals that are Printed :
 The Doctors of the *Talmud* attribute the Original of these Benedicti-
 ons or Prayers to *Esdra*s and the *Sanhedrin* in his time ; they declare
 that there happened a great confusion in the *Hebrew* Tongue, after that
 the impious *Nebuchadnezzar* had carried their Nation into Captivity,
 and that their Ancient Language was mingled with *Persian*, *Grecian*
 and other words, which obliged *Esdra*s to compile a Certain Manual,
 consisting of eighteen Benedictions or Prayers in *Hebrew*, that Unifor-
 mity might be preserved in the Synagogues.

R. Moysen
 en son Abr.
 du Talm.
 Traie
 Tephila,
 ch. i. n. 4.

35.

The Primitive Christians did not only read in their Assemblies the
 Law of *Moses* and the Prophets in imitation of the Jews, but they al-
 so made use of some of their Prayers that were written in *Hebrew*,
 which St. Paul calls with them *Benedictions and giving of thanks* ; this
 the Holy Apostle doth not condemn, but tells them on the contrary,
 Ibid. v. 17. that these kinds of Prayers are regular, *Σὺ μὲν γὰρ καλῶς εὐχαρισεῖς*. For
thou verily givest Thanks well, he only blames them because they had no
 Interpreters : This is his meaning when he adds a little after, *I had ra-
 ther speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach
 others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown Tongue.*

v. 19.

Hilary a learned Deacon of the Sect of the *Luciferians*, who hath
 written Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul, which have been a-
 scribed until those later times to St. *Ambrose*, confirms every thing
 that I have now alledged : He assures us in his Explication of the 14th
 Chap. of the 1st Epistle of St. Paul to the *Corinthians*, that mention
 is made in that place of those *Hebrews* that sometimes spake *Syriac*,
 and very often the ancient *Hebrew* in their Preachings, or in the Office
 of the Liturgy, to recommend their Discourses by the means of the
 respect that was due to these Languages and to their Ancestors. *Hi*
 Ambrosiast. in Epist. 1. *ex Hebraeis erant*, (saith this Author) *qui aliquando Syra lingua, plerunque*
 ad Cor. *Hebraea, in tractatibus aut oblationibus utebantur ad commendationem. Glo-*
 14. *riabantur enim se dici Hebraeos propter meritum Abrahae.* This perfectly
 agrees with what hath been above observed. St. Paul would not have
 disapproved their Practice, if they had at the same time interpreted
 their Sermons, and thereby rendred them intelligible to the other
 Christians of *Corinth* who understood neither *Hebrew* nor *Syriac*.

This Apostle was very willing that a foreign Tongue should be
 Epist. 1. spoken in the Congregations, as he insinuates by these words, *linguam*
 ad Cor. c. *habet, interpretationem habet ; hath a Tongue, hath an Interpretation ; on*
 14. v. 26. *which*

which the above cited Author makes this Reflection (a) *St. Paul, not to offend those that could speak to others in unknown Tongues, grants them this liberty; on condition nevertheless that they should add the interpretation; therefore he subjoins, interpretationem habet, that they might be permitted to Discourse in these Languages, if an Interpreter were present.* His design was not absolutely to prohibit the use of unknown Tongues, but only to prevent the confusion that might thereupon ensue in the publick Service; for intending to remedy such Disorders, he thought it convenient to establish this Law, *If any man speak in an unknown Tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course, and let one interpret:* On which Hilary the Deacon hath made this Observation, (b) *That St. Paul doth not allow above three at most to speak in an unknown Tongue, lest the whole time of the Assembly should be spent by them and their Interpreters, and there should be no opportunity left for the Prophets to Expound the H. Scriptures, and to instruct the Church by their Preaching and Doctrin.*

Ibid. v. 27.

This is, as I believe, the true sense of the words in the 14th Chap. of his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, which do not favour the objections of the Protestants against the Catholics; for *St. Paul* doth not condemn the practice of Discoursing in the Church in unknown Tongues, but only regulates the manner of speaking them to avoid confusion. *Dr. Lightfoot* who was well versed in the ancient Customs of the Jews, and applied himself to that particular Study, could not deny that this unknown Tongue, mentioned by the Apostle, is the *Hebrew*, and that he permits the use of foreign Languages with the assistance of an Interpreter. *Tolerat Apostolus, (saith this Protestant) linguam ignotam, si adesset interpres.—Opinamur ergo, nec sine ratione, linguam istam ignotam qua usi sunt isti, vel potius abusi, in Ecclesia fuisse linguam Hebraam.* It is very strange that this Doctor should account the Custom that was then received in the Christian Assemblies, as well as in the Synagogues, of speaking in an unknown Tongue, to be an abuse; and should acknowledg at the same time, that (c) *the Holy Ghost had restored to the Ministers of the Church the knowledge of the Hebrew Tongue that was disused; and this for the benefit of the same Church.* Moreover he asserts that this Language was at that time necessary to be

Lightf.

Hor. Heb.

in Epist. I.

ad Cor.

c. 14.

(a) *Ut eos qui lingua loqui poterant non contristaret, permisit eos loqui linguis; ita tamen ut interpretatio sequeretur. Ideo ait, interpretationem habet, ut si interpres adesset, daretur locus loquendi linguis. Ambrosiast. Comm. in Epist. I. ad Cor. c. 14.*

(b) *Ideo ergo ut multum tres ne occuparent diem linguis loquentes & interpretes illorum, & non haberent Prophetæ tempus Scripturas edisserendi, qui sunt totius Ecclesiæ illuminatores. Ambrosiast. ibid.*

(c) *Lingua Hebræa quæ jam olim a communi & vernaculo usu desueverat, jam donante Spiritu Sancto reddita est ministris Ecclesiæ, idque necessario atque in commodum Ecclesiæ. Lightf. Hor. Heb. in Epist. I. ad Cor. c. 14.*

understood by the said Ministers, and that for this reason, *St. Paul* permitted it to be spoken, because it served to give a greater light into the Original Text of the *H. Scriptures*. (*d*) *The Hebrew Text* (saith *Dr. Lightfoot*) was unknown to the common People; the Version of the *Septuagint* was full of faults; the *Chaldaic Paraphrase* on the *Prophets* was extravagant and judaizing, and there was no *Paraphrase* as yet on the *Law*, insomuch that it was impossible to penetrate into the true meaning of the sacred Text, without being inspired with the *Hebrew Tongue* and the genuine sense of the *H. Scriptures*.

This is the notion of a bigotted Protestant that suits every thing to the model of his Religion: He is obliged to confess that in the time of *St. Paul* the *Hebrew Tongue* was spoken in the publick Assemblies of the Christians; but that he might not be compelled to own that it was Lawful for the Church of *Rome* also to make use of the *Latin Tongue* in her Offices, he hath recourse to. I know not what suppositions that have no solid foundation, to grant this priviledg to the *Hebrew Tongue* alone; and feigns that the Holy Ghost in those Primitive times, gave to the Ministers of the Church an exact knowledg of the *Hebrew* by Inspiration, that they might more clearly understand the sense of the *H. Scriptures*. But was it not sufficient that he Communicated to them the true scope and meaning of the Sacred Writings, that they might afterwards Expound them to others in their Native Languages? For none, according to his Opinion, spake *Hebrew* at that time; and therefore the gift of the *Hebrew Tongue* was not necessary to Preach the Gospel of *Jesus Christ*; besides, the Apostles used the *Septuagint Bible*. If *Dr. Lightfoot* had studied the *Greek Tongue* with the same diligence as he did that of the *Rabbins*, he would have done more Justice to those ancient *Grecian* Interpreters. The interpretation of *Hilary* the Deacon, above related, is much more accurate in this matter..

But after all, notwithstanding the endeavours of this Protestant Author, to pervert the true sense of *St. Paul's* words, he could not deny that the Text of the Bible was read in *Hebrew* in the Church of *Corinth*, which (as he believed) consisted of many *Hebrews*; that the common Prayers, and even the Sermons were made in that Language; and lastly, that the Practice of the *Jews* in their Synagogues was exactly followed herein, *Dum hac cogito*, (saith *Dr. Lightfoot*) *usitata in Synagogis Judæorum, meminique magnam partem Ecclesiæ Corinthiæ consistisse ex Judæis, non possum non suspicari & ministros eorundem lingua usos pro veteri more; hunc nempe legisse Scripturam ex textu Hebræo; illum orasse*

Lightf.
ibid.

(*d*) *Textus originalis erat vulgo ignotus. Versio LXX. Interpretum erat in locis infinitis mendosa. Targum in Prophetas vagum & judaizans. Targum in Legem adhuc omnino nullum; ita ut impossibile foret mentem Dei in textu sacro pandere, absque dono immediato Spiritus peritiam & linguæ & sensus perfectam plenamque imperviente. Lightf. ibid.*

vel concionatum esse lingua Hebraea pro consuetudine usitata in Synagogis.
 This being granted, I cannot apprehend why the Protestants exclaim so vehemently against the Church of Rome, because she celebrates Divine Service in a Language that is not understood by the People. Furthermore it is evident that this Church had Versions in the vulgar Tongue, not only of the Bible, but also of the Liturgy or Rituals, when they revolted from her, as shall be hereafter proved by a great number of Examples. Let us begin then with Germany.

Luther is the first of the Protestants that Translated the H. Scriptures into the Vulgar Tongue. *Matthaeus* who was one of his Companions, and that wrote his Life, declares that he had seen in his Youth a Bible in old High Dutch, that was much esteemed by the Learned in those times: He affirms moreover that his Father had the Gospels of the Sundays and of the whole Year, as also some Books of the Old Testament, with the Glosses or Postils, in the same Language. *Waltherus*, who was likewise famous amongst the Lutheran party, assures us that there were three Editions of the Bible in the German Tongue before that of his Patriarch Martin.

Matthaei.
 Conc. 13.
 de vita
 Luth.

Miche-
 Walther.
 in Offic.
 Bibl.

As for Italy, besides the Italian Bible of *Jacobus de Voragine* Archbishop of Genoua, there are extant divers Copies of another Version in the same Language made by *Malermi*, or *Malherbi* Abbot of a Monastery of the Order of St. Benet: The first Edition that I have seen of this Translation, is that of the year 1471, in *Kalende de Ottobrio*; there was also another Edition in the year 1477, as appears from these words that are read at the end of the New Testament, *Fu impresso questo volume nel alma patria de Venetia per Maestro Gabriel de Piero Trevisano regnante Sisto Quarto Pontifice Maximo & Andrea Vendrantino inclito Duce di Venetia negli anni dela salutarifera Incarnazione del figliol di leterno & omnipotente Dio 1477.* I have also seen a third Edition of this same Bible, Printed in the year 1507, Entituled *Biblia Vulgare Historiata*, wherein these words are inserted at the end, *Stampata in Venetia per Bartholomio de Zanni da Portes ad instantia di Luca Antonio de Giunta Fiorentino nel 1507.* These Editions of the Italian Bible of Abbot *Malermi* the Benedictin Monk, were perused throughout all Italy, before the Name of Protestant was known in Europe: The Author himself informs us that there were Italian Translations of the Holy Scriptures a great while before his time; for he declares in an Epistle prefixed to his Work, that this great Volume of the Bible had been formerly Translated: *Che gia per passati tempi e stato traduto esso magno volume dela Biblia in vulgare & lingua materna.* But forasmuch as he had observed many faults in the Ancient Italian Version which he marks, he was obliged to publish a new one that was more exact: Lastly he Protests that he hath had respect to the benefit of good Catholics in putting into their hands a Bible in the vulgar Tongue. Considerata la non puoca anzi magna & salutarifera utilita che conseguirebbono li Catholici veri amatori deli eterni beni.

Malherbi
 Epist. ca-
 pit. 6.

Ibid.
 cap. 7.

Never-

Nevertheless we have heard some Protestants avouching, that before they appeared in the World, the Catholics altogether neglected the Reading of the Sacred Writings. But without departing out of Italy, we shall find these, that the People had in their possession several Translations of the Epistles and Gospels that are read at Mass, during the course of the whole Year : There hath been an Edition of them in the Year 1483. under the Pontificate of Sixtus IV. the Title whereof is as followeth, *Epistole Evangelii, quali se legono in tutto l' anno alla Messa, cioe Dominicali festivi & feriali secondo l' uso dela Sancta Giesia Romana, anno salutis 1483. sedente Sixto IV. Pontifice Maximo anno ejus tredecimo.* These kinds of Works that were then very common, were composed on purpose for the instruction of the People ; and it may be Affirmed that in some manner they supplied the place of those Interpreters concerning whom mention is made in the 1st Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, Chap. 14.

In 1510. Let us now come into France, where we shall find in the Kings Library five Volumes in Folio, Printed in the beginning of the last Age, which contain Explications in French, of the whole Office of the Year ; the first Volume bears this Title, *Les grandes Postilles & Expositions sur les Epistoles Leçons & Evangiles de tout le Careme.* It is also Entituled in Latin, *Postilla majores sacrorum Evangeliorum, nec non Epistolarum atque Lectionum totius Quadragesime Passionis Christi quatuor Evangelistarum, ac per Octavas ipsius resurrectionis Dominica, cum pluribus questiuiculis dubiorumque resolutionibus, concordantiis, annotationibus desuper additionibus sacrorum Doctorum una cum morali pradiſtorum Evangeliorum expositione in vulgatum sermonem nostrum a Petro des Rey Oratore quondam Trecatio, anno virginiei partus quingentesimo decimo supra millesimum traducta.*

Hence it appears that the Divines of France were not only content to give the Bible to the People in their Native Tongue, but in like manner Translated the Offices of the whole Year with Notes or Explications taken from the Fathers and Doctors of the Church: This was the Method that they made use of, to Instruct the Ignorant Vulgar, before the Protestants Published their new Translations with Annotations after their Fashion. We read at the end of the second Volume of their Postils, which is also for Lent, that it was Printed in the Year 1511. with the King's Priviledg for three Years, *par Anthoine Verard Libraire demourant a Paris sur le pont Nostre Dame a lymaige St. Jehan, ou au palais au premier pilier devant la chapelle ou len chante la Messe de Messieurs les Presidens.* The three other Volumes contain the Exposition of the Epistles and Gospels of the whole Year, Printed by the same Anthony Verard, with the King's Priviledg for three Years only, the two last are Dated Anno. 1512. but there is no Approbation annexed to any of them, neither of the Doctors nor of the Bishop of the Diocese.

Our Kings have always been very curious in Reading the Bible in their Mother Tongue ; for besides what hath been already observed elsewhere, concerning the Version of *Nicolas Oresme*, by the order of *Charles V.* I have found in the King's Library the Edition of *Peter Comestor*, Printed in French under the Title of *Bible Historiale*, which is the Translation of *Guiars des Moulins* that was thought to this present time to be only in Manuscript : It appears by a little Preface prefixed thereto, that it was composed by the special Command of King *Charles VIII.* whom he accosts in these words, *En perseverant toujours de bonne affection vouloir accomplir & faire vos bons plaisirs & commandemens mon tres souverain Seigneur Charles VIII. de ce nom tres Chretien Roy de France, a la louange de la benoistre Trinite de Paradis & de vous chier Sire apres que par vous me a ete commande vous ay fait la Bible historiee contenant deux volumes ou sont les histoires scholastiques. Lesquels livres historiques furent jadis translates par un excellent Docteur de Latin en François, comme vous pourres voir cy apres en suivant. In persevering always with sincere Affection, to be ready to accomplish your good Pleasure and Commands, my most Sovereign Lord Charles VIII. of this Name, most Christian King of France, to the Praise of the Blessed Trinity, of Paradise, and of You my dear Lord, being Commanded by You, I have Compiled this Historical Bible, consisting of two Volumes, wherein are contained the Scholastical Histories ; which Historical Books were formerly Translated by an excellent Doctor out of Latin into French, as you may see hereafter :* He means *Guiars des Moulins*, whose Preface he afterwards adjoyns. The Printer of this Historical Bible is the same *Antony Verard* above mentioned.

There is also in the King's Library a part of the Psalter Translated into French, with Notes in the same Language, taken from the Doctors of the Church: This Book is likewise Dedicated to *Charles VIII.* and an Epistle at the beginning thereof shews, that it was made and published by the appointment of that Prince. Seeing these kinds of Works are very rarely to be found at this day, I shall here produce some extract of this Epistle, which begins thus, *Ou nom de Dieu infallible & tout puissant a la louange de sa glorieuse Mere, de toute la Court celestielle & en lonneur & reverence de la Souveraine & Royal Majeste de vous Charles par la grace de Dieu Roy de France huitieme de ce nom. In the Name of the Infallible and Almighty God, to the Praise of his Glorious Mother, and of the whole Celestial Court, and to the Honour of the Sovereign and Royal Majesty of Charles VIII. of this Name, by the Grace of God King of France. We read a little after, Considerant que des la vostre premiere enfance comme plain de bonne doctrine & abbreve du fleuve de sapience avez aime & sur toute rien parfaitement desire venir a la connoissance des choses a voir toutes Histories & nobles faits mesmement encore dont trop plus estes a louer les difficultes & nobles thesors de la Sainte Escriture, comme devot imitateur de vos ayens & ancestres les glorieux & saints*

Saints Roys de France Monseigneur Saint Charles & Saint Louis. — A celle cause Sire acceptant vostre vouloir & tres humble commandement selon la capacite de mon foible entendement ai pris la peine a plaisir tres curieux a vous faire l'exposition du Pseautier du Prophete David & autres Prophetes du Latin en François, & avec ce y mettre la glose & la declaration des termes & de la sentence selon l'opinion commune des Docteurs de Sainte Eglise. Considering that from your very Infancy, which was imbued with wholsom Doctrin and watered with the River of Wisdom; you have Studied, and above all things, earnestly desired to attain to the knowledg of Things, to read Books, Histories and Relations of generous Exploits, and have also been very much addicted to search into the difficult places and noble Treasures of the Holy Scriptures, as being a Devout Imitator. of your Grandfathers and Ancestors the Glorious and Holy Kings of France, St. Charles and St. Lewes. — For this cause Sir, being informed of your good Pleasure and Command, I have taken pains according to the Capacity of my weak understanding, to Translate for your use the Psalter of the Prophet David, and other Prophets, out of Latin into French, as also to insert therein the Annotations and Explication of the Words and Sense according to the common Opinion of the Doctors of Holy Church.

Prolog.
Franc. sur
les Ps.

Altho this Work was Written in a time when the Divines applied themselves but little to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, nevertheless it was collected with sufficient Judgment; his principal Author is de Lira, whom he names Master Nicolas de Lira. Let us see what he saith concerning the Writers of the Psalms in general, from whence we may take an Estimate of his Exactness, Combien que Monseigneur S. Augustin dit que le Prophete Royal David ait este acteur & compositeur de tous les Pseumes contenus ou Pseautier. Toutefois Monseigneur S. Hierosme tres soigneux ou texte de la Sainte Ecriture, pourquoy en ce cas on doit adjouter plus grande foy & credence a luy dit le contraire. Car ou prologue de ce present livre il nomme dix acteurs & compositeurs. Altho St. Augustin declares that the Royal Prophet David was the Author and Composer of all the Psalms contained in the Psalter; nevertheless St. Hierom was very diligent and careful in Examining the Text of the Holy Scriptures, therefore greater Credit ought to be given to him in this matter, who hath affirmed the contrary; for in the Preface of this present Book he reckons up ten Authors and Composers. He puts in the Margin the words of M. Nicolas de Lira in Latin; which he observes also with respect to St. Jerom, St. Augustin, and some other Authors Cited by him, whom he Expounds after his usual manner in French; Moreover he always Exhibits the Text of the Psalms in Latin, to which he adjoyns his Translation.

He makes this Remark on the Title of the first Psalm, where he reads Pseume de David: Ce ne doit pas estre repute vray: car ce y auroit este mis par aucun non ayant autorite ne connoissance de la Royale verite; mais
seulement

Seulement par plaisir volontaire. Ce apert, parce que David ne le fit ne composa jamais ; mais la fait & compose le Prophete Esdras par maniere de Prologue par luy premis a ce present livre. A Psalm of David : This ought not to be accounted true, for it hath been added by some person that had no Authority nor Knowledge of the Truth, but presumed to insert it of his own accord ; this is apparent, because David never composed it, since it was made by the Prophet Esdras in the nature of a Preface by him premised to this Book. Such Reflections as these written in French are evident Proofs that the ignorant People might study the Holy Scriptures in Books Published in their own proper Language. It is read in the end of this Volume, which is somewhat large, and nevertheless contains but part of the Psalms, Cy finit le premier volume du Pseautier imprime par Pierre Rouge Libraire du Roy nostre Sire. Here ends the first Volume of the Psalter, Printed by Peter Rouge, Bookseller to the King.

Besides this Commentary on the Psalms, I have seen in the King's Library a French Translation of all the Epistles of St. Paul, with large Annotations in the same Language. *Antony Verard* who is the Printer of this Work, hath prefixed an Epistle in Verse, Dedicated to the Queen, that begins thus ;

*Tres honoree & excellente Princesse
Humble Dame qui n'aves prins cesse
De comprendre devots livres & lire
Plus que nul que je connoisse Dame
Car noble estes tant de cuer corps que d' ame, &c.*

*Illustrious Princess born of Noble Race,
Whose chiefest care's the Sacred Books to Trace,
Whose great Humility so far exceeds
The Glory of thy Sex, or famous deeds :
Thy matchless Virtues by pure Grace resign'd,
Shine forth most bright in Body, Heart and Mind, &c.*

I might here mention many other Books of the like Nature, that were in France in the hands of the People, before the Novelties of the Protestants were heard of in Europe : The Calvinists themselves of Geneva confess that they are not the first Authors of the French Translations of the Bible. We have (saith Turretin) yet in our Hands ^{Bened. Turret. Defens. de} certain old French Translations in the Library of Geneva ; there is to be ^{Traduct de Gen. cont. le} seen therein a French Bible Translated by Girard des Moulins Canon of ^{P. Cotton.} St. Peter d' Aire in the Bishopric of Terouenne, about the Year, 1290. That which was Revised by M. Nicholas Oresme, a Divine of the School

of Paris is not lost : There are others also that were published before ours.
 * The first one at Lions, Anno. 1521. And another at Antwerp * Anno. 1534.
 Edition of this Bible was Printed in the year 1530. With the priviledg of Charles V. and the approbation of the Divines of Louvain. This Minister pretends, indeed, that the greatest part of these Bibles were no where to be found but in the Closets of persons of Quality, and that they were not read by the Ignorant People; but this can be true only with relation to the MSS. Bibles, as hath been already observed : For as for the Printed Versions, and especially those that were then called *Postils*, they were very common, and if they are since become scarce, it is because these sorts of Books being written in a rude and simple Style, were wholly laid aside as soon as better and more elegant Translations of the Holy Scriptures were composed.

Spain was furnished with no less a number of Versions of the Sacred Writings in the vulgar Tongue than France, if we may believe a Spanish Author who hath written on this Subject in the Year 1556. He asserts (e) that the Bible was Published about 130 Years before, in the Language of *Valentia* where he was Born, and that this Spanish Translation was Reprinted about 40 Years ago in a very fair Character ; but it was afterwards forbidden to be read by the Inquisition, on occasion of certain concealed Jews that remained in Spain ; This Prohibition (saith he) extended only to those that were Originally Jews, and not in the least to others : The same care was taken throughout the whole Kingdom of Spain, because almost all the Provinces of that Country had the Bible Translated into their own peculiar Dialects. The same Author subjoyns in another place, that the Gospels of the whole Year were Printed in the Spanish Tongue of *Valentia*, with the Permission of the Popes and Inquisitors of Spain; and that he had read the Epistles of St. Paul Translated into Verse in the Language of the Castellans and that of the People of *Valentia*, *Sunt Valentina lingua* (saith he) *omnia Evangelica Historia capita quacunque in orbem toto anno ad populum decantantur eleganter & fideliter versa, quæ nisi essent fideliter translata, nunquam esset per Pontifices & Inquisitores Hispaniarum concessum ut imprimerentur, utpote qui in hujusmodi negotiis diligentissimi sunt, severissimi, & pene dixerim supersticiosi maxime. Vidi*

Frid. Furii
Cæriol.
Valent.
Bononia,
p. 111.
edit. Basil.
Anno.
1556.

Ibid. p.
329.

(e) Fuit centum & triginta ab hinc annis plus minus versa Scriptura in Valentina linguam, & quadraginta aut circiter ab hinc annis iterum iisdem literis elegantius multo impressa, quam populo interdixit Inquisitorum quos vocant societas & ordo hoc nomine, quod Judeis aliquot, qui de centum & viginti millibus ex Hispania exactis supererant dicerent se intelligere ipsos ritus & ceremonias & sacrificandi genus ab ipsis Bibliis desumere. Itaque ita vetitum est eam legi, ut iis qui originem nullam a Judeis haberent legi liceret; aliis non item. Idem in universa Hispania cautum est. Habebant enim fere reliquæ Hispaniæ nationes etiam Biblia in suam quæque linguam versa. Frid. Furii Bononia.

etiam ac legi Epistolas Pauli carmine interpretatas tum mea, tum Castellana, ut vocant, lingua.

Cyprian de Valera makes mention also of a Spanish Version of all the Holy Scriptures in the Idiom of *Valentia*, and declares that it was made with the Priviledg of the Inquisitors, and principally of St. Vincent Ferrer. *La Biblia en lengua Valenciana con licencia de los Inquisidores a cuja translacion asisto S. Vincente Ferrer.* It would be needless to enlarge any further thereupon, since I intend to treat of all these Versions in particular in the sequel of this Critical History. Cyp. de Val. in the Pref. to his Spanish Version.

C H A P. III.

Of the Ancient Latin Version of the New Testament, that was used in the Western Churches, before it was Corrected by St. Jerom.

IT cannot be doubted but the Western Churches, especially those of *Italy*, have read the Holy Scriptures in their publick Assemblies ever since the Primitive Ages of the Christian Religion: This gave occasion to the *Latin* Translation of the whole Bible, which was then in *Greek*. It is also probable that at first it was only read in that Language, which was in those times very common at *Rome*, the first Bishops of that great City having Written in *Greek*; but in regard that the ignorant People spake *Latin* altogether, and the Christian Religion was spread abroad in *Italy*, and throughout all the Western Countries, it was necessary to have a Version in the vulgar Tongue. This ancient Translation was called the *Italic*, because it seemed, indeed, to take its Original from *Italy*, from whence it was afterwards conveyed, together with Religion, to all the other Provinces of the West. Father Amelote hath given us a large Account of this ancient Version of the New Testament. It is denied by none (saith he) that this ancient *Italic Translation*, which according to the Opinion of the most Learned Divines, was made in the time of the Apostles, and, perhaps, even by their Order, was composed from the most correct Copies that were then extant in the Church. But since he hath produced no proofs to confirm his Allegations, it would not be reasonable to give credit to him in this particular on his bare word. If we may judg on the contrary, of this Version from the *Greek* Copies above mentioned in the first part of this

this History, to which it was conformable, we shall have no very good Opinion thereof.

P. Amel.
ibid.

It were merely to conjecture, to affirm with Father Amelore, *That none can doubt that St. Jerom having found it altered by Heretics or Ignorant Transcribers, restored it to its Primitive Purity by the means of certain Greek Copies that were most agreeable to the first Originals.* Nothing hath happened to the ancient *Latin* Version, nor to the *Greek* Copies from whence it was taken, but what usually befalls the most part of Books in process of time: We ought therefore to argue with respect to the *Greek* Copies of the New Testament and the *Latin* Version thereof, after the same manner as in reference to the *Greek* Translation of the Septuagint, and the *Latin* that was taken from it: Now it is certain that the *Greek* Copies of the lxx were very much corrupted before *Origen* took pains to Correct them; these Errors had also crept into the *Latin* Translation of the Old Testament that was used for many Ages throughout all the Western Countries, and the alterations were so great, that *Origen's* Art of Critic could not entirely remedy them. Almost the same Accidents have happened to the *Greek* Copies of the New Testament, that were altered in many places (according to the Testimony of *Origen*) in the Primitive Ages of the Church: However I dare not avouch that the *Italic* Version of the New Testament was then composed from the *Greek* Copies thus defaced, which were those that have been represented in the first part of this Work; at least it is evident that it was in a lamentable condition before St. *Jerom* reformed it.

Neither ought these alterations that have nothing extraordinary in them, and are common to all Books that fall into the hands of the People, to be attributed to the Heretics: We shall therefore make a distinction between two sorts of Editions of the New Testament in *Greek*, as two different kinds of the Septuagint were distinguished heretofore, one whereof was called *χρηνη vulgar*, and the other pure and true, being that which was found in the *Hexapla's* of *Origen*. The ancient Version of the New Testament, named the *Italic*, was conformable to the vulgar *Greek* Edition; but St. *Jerom* amended it from the most correct *Greek* Copies that were revised by able Critics: This Learned Father indeed, doth sometimes make mention of the Copies of *Origen* and *Pierius* that were more accurate than the vulgar Editions. However, it cannot be doubted but the *Latin* Church hath obtained a Version almost ever since the beginning of Christianity, which was used in the publick Service, and remained in the hands of the Vulgar that were incapable of reading the Originals; nevertheless *Maldonat* and some other late Divines have denied that this Church ever had any such peculiar or determined Translation of the New Testament in the Primitive Ages, which they endeavoured to prove, because St. *Cyprian* and

and the other Fathers that lived in those times have not cited any common Version, but have themselves Translated the passages of the Holy Scriptures from the Greek as often as they had occasion. Cy- Mald.
 prianus (saith Maldonat) non solebat Versionem ullam citare, qua vix Comm.
 illa ejus atate apud Latinos communis erat; sed ipse quoties Scripturam in cap. 1.
 citabat, de Græco Vertebat. Joann.

Mr. Arnauld was of the same Opinion when he opposed to Father Amelore the words of St. Augustin, who informs us in his Books of the Christian Doctrin, that there were innumerable Latin Versions, and that (f) in the Primitive Times when the Faith was first Established, as soon as any one found a Greek Copy, and thought that he had a competent knowledge of both Languages, he presumed to Translate it. This Doctor doth not deny that the Latin Church, as soon as it was planted, had in her possession Translations of the Holy Scriptures in that Tongue. But who can tell (continues he) since there was at the beginning M. Arn.
 a very great number of different Versions, as St. Augustin Testifieth, whe- Nouv.
 ther the Italic was one of the first? And we have this reason to doubt there- Def. du
 of, because Tertullian, who is the most Ancient of these Latin Doctors, N. T. de
 whose Works are yet extant, and who lived a great while after the Death of Mons,
 the Apostles, hath not made use of this Translation. It doth not appear liv. 1.
 that the Jesuit Maldonat and Mr. Arnauld have sufficiently considered ch. 10.
 this matter relating to the ancient Version of the Western Churches; for they confound the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers who understood the Greek Tongue, with the Ignorant People that had no knowledge thereof. This Translation which St. Augustin calls Italic, was composed to be read in the publick Assemblies; and Mr. Arnauld will not disown that every Nation hath read the Bible in their Congregations in their proper Language; wherefore the Original of the ancient Latin Version in the West, ought to be ascribed to this Custom; but this did not hinder private Persons that had some Skill in the Greek Tongue from making Translations from the Originals.

The particular Versions had nothing in common with that which was read in the public Service; therefore if this distinction be observed, we shall easily resolve the objections taken from Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and some other Fathers who do not agree in their Citations with the ancient Italic Translation. Tertullian and St. Cyprian read the vulgar Edition with the People that was then in use in their Churches, because they could not do otherwise; but they took the liberty in their Works to have recourse to the Original, and to Tran-

(f) Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex Græcus, & aliquan-
 tum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere videbatur ausus est interpretari. August.
 lib. 2 de Doct. Christ. c. 11.

state it as they thought fit; and it is on this account that they have sometimes rendred the same *Greek* passages after different manners. St. *Augustin*, who understood but very little of the *Greek* Tongue, had reason to prefer the *Italic* before all the other Translations. *In ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala ceteris preferatur*; but notwithstanding this choice, he thinks it convenient that as to the Old Testament application should be made to the *Greek* of the *LXX* Interpreters. *Latini ergo* (saith he) *ut dicere caperem, codices Veteris Testamenti, si necesse fuerit, Græcorum auctoritate emendandi sunt, & eorum potissimum qui cum Septuaginta essent ore uno interpretati esse perhibentur.* As for the New Testament he adviseth also when there happens any variation in the *Latin* Copies, to consult the best of the *Greek* thereupon. *Libros autem Novi Testamenti, si quid in Latinis varietatibus tinnat, Græcis cedere oportere non dubium est, & maxime qui apud Ecclesias doctores & diligentiores reperiuntur.*

Aug. lib.
2 de
Doctr.
Christ.
cap. 15.

Aug. ibid.

Ibid.

This last Reflection of St. *Augustin* proves that in his time the Copies of the *Italic* Version were different, and therefore it ought not to be concluded from this Diversity that occurs in the Books of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, that different *Latin* Translations were then read in the Western Churches; for besides what hath been already intimated, that private persons enjoyed the liberty of Composing New Translations from the Originals; amongst a great number of various readings that were found in the *Latin* Copies, they preferred those that they judged to be the best; this may also be observ'd in St. *Augustin* who sometimes mentions these diversities, and chiefly esteems that reading which he believes to be most conformable to the *Greek*. St. *Cyprian*, whom *Maldonat* quotes, hath not exactly followed the vulgar Edition of his time, having sometimes more respect to the sense of the words, than to the Text of the ancient *Latin* Interpretation; insomuch, that instead of these words, *Ne nos inducas in tentationem*, lead us not into Temptation, that are at the end of the Lord's Prayer, he reads, *Ne nos patiaris induci in tentationem*, suffer us not to be lead into temptation, which he took from *Tertullian*, who in his Book concerning Prayer, explains the former words by the later. St. *Augustin* after he hath taken notice that it was read in some Copies, *Ne nos inferas*; and in others, *Ne nos inducas*, adds, that many in Praying, said *Ne nos patiaris induci in tentationem*, Expounding thereby what was meant by the word *inducas*. *Multi precando ita dicunt, Ne nos patiaris induci in tentationem, exponentes videlicet quomodo dictum sit inducas.*

Cypr. de
Orat.
Domin.
Tertul.
lib. de
Orat.
cap. 8.

Aug. lib. 2.
de Serm.
Dom. in
monte.
cap. 9.

Furthermore, altho *Tertullian*, St. *Cyprian* and some other Fathers do not always follow in their Writings the ancient *Latin* Version that was called the *Italic*; nevertheless they do not so far depart from it, but that it may be perceived that it was used in their time; I have observed this in comparing the ancient *Latin* Translation

tion, the greatest part whereof is yet extant at this day in old Manuscript Copies, with the Works of these ancient Fathers: This further appears also in the Writings of *Hilary* a Deacon of the Sect of the *Luciferians*, who hath written learned Commentaries on the Epistles of *St. Paul*, that have been attributed to *St. Ambrose*, he therein generally agrees with the *Latin* Version of these Epistles that is annexed to the ancient *Greek* Manuscript in the King's Library, and with that of the Abbey of *St. Germain des Pres*.

Besides these proofs that shew that there was a *Latin* Translation named *Italic* in all the Western Churches before the time of this Father; the ancient *English-Saxon* Version of the Gospels, lately Printed, doth plainly demonstrate that this *Italic* was in the Churches of Great Britain when the Gospels were there Translated into that Language: Tho this Translation is conveyed to us with very great imperfections, yet there is enough remaining, from whence we may judge that it was made from the *Italic*; a Copy whereof, containing the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles is still preserved in the Library of *Cambridg*: This may be proved by certain additions and other differencies that are peculiar to this *Greek* and *Latin* Manuscript of *Cambridg*, which are found also in the *English-Saxon* Version; they are particularly enumerated in Mr. *Marshall's* Observations on this Translation, which is so agreeable to the Copy of *Cambridg* that was heretofore in the Possession of *Beza*, that he Printed part of his Observations under this Title, *Loca aliquot Versi-*
onis, quæ a Vulgata Latina, quæ nos utimur, discrepantia, cum vetustissimo
illo Græco Latino Codice Theodori Beza potissimum consentiunt.

Tho. Marefch.
 in Vers.
 Anglo-Sax. 1.
 495.

This learned *English* Writer seems to have been somewhat scrupulous in publishing such considerable Variations in the Books of the New Testament, for he subjoyns at the end of his Observations, (g) That he hath not produced these different readings with a design to diminish the authority of the present Copies, much less to justify the Errors of these Versions; but to shew that the Author of the *English-Saxon* Translation hath followed a *Latin* Version that hath escaped, at least in some places, the Correction of *St. Jerom*. He might have freely declared that it was an ancient *Latin* Version that was used in the Western Churches, before this Father Revised it by the Order of *Pope Damasus*; if it contained any Errors, they proceeded rather from the Original

(g) Quas quidem produxi (variantes lectiones) nullo profecto studio elevandi auctoritatem illius quæ apud nos obtinet lectionis, nedum Versionum erroribus patrocinandi; sed ut hinc lectori constet, interpretem hunc nostrum secutum fuisse Versionem quandam Latinam antiquam, quæ Hieronymi non passa est, in aliquibus saltem, emendationem. Tho. Marefch. Observ. in Vers. Anglo-Sax. p. 508.

Greek from which it was Translated, than from the Interpreter, since these same Errors are equally found in the Greek from whence it was taken.

C H A P. IV.

A particular Examination of the ancient Version of the New Testament called the Italic, which is yet extant at this day in some ancient Manuscripts.

THE Latin Church is very much obliged to St. Jerom for Reforming the ancient Version of the New Testament from the most Correct Greek Copies that he could find, since it was in a great confusion, as he himself assures us in his Epistle to Pope Damasus: However he neglected not to peruse some Latin Copies, and perhaps it were to be wished that he had consulted them oftner; for the Greek whereof he made use, not being the first Originals of the Apostles, it was requisite that he should also have recourse to the Latin Books that were taken from them: Altho he doth not intimate in his Letter to this Pope that he hath observed this Method, nevertheless it appears from his Commentaries and other Writings, that he sometimes calls to his Assistance the different Latin Copies of the New Testament: He Protests in this same Letter that he hath receded from the ancient Latin Edition as little as possibly he could, and only when the Sense required it, *iis tantum quæ sensum videbantur mutare correctis*. Nevertheless it is a difficult matter to vindicate him altogether on the account of some alterations that he seems to have made without any necessity: As for example, what cause was there to change the word *quotidianum*, Matt. chap. 6. v. 11. which was in the ancient Vulgar, into that of *super substantialem*, which is Equivocal? The word *quotidianum* on the contrary, very clearly explains the meaning of that passage, and agrees also with what is read in the Hebrew or Chaldaic Gospel of the Nazareans.

Hier.
Præf. in 4
Evang.
ad Dam.

Altho St. Jerom reads in his Edition in the second Chapter of the same Evangelist, *Vox in Rama audita est*; a voice was heard in Rama; yet he doth not believe that Rama ought to be taken in this place for a proper Name, but that the Hebrew word of the Prophet Jeremy is here retained, which signifies High, insomuch that according to his Opinion it must be written *rama*, and not *Rama*; and then the Sense will be this, *a voice was heard on high*, that is, dispersed

perfed far and near; *Quod autem* (faith he) *dicitur in Rama*, non HierCom.
putamus loci nomen esse juxta Gabaa, sed rama excelfum interpretatur, ut in cap. 2.
fit fensus, Vox in excelfo audita est, id est, tonge lateque difperfa. But Matth.
 St. Matthew without doubt intended with the lxx. to fpecify the
 name of a place.

If an enquiry be made into the greater number of *Greek* Manu-
 fcripts, it will appear that St. Jerom had no reason to take away
 from the fifth Chapter of St. Matthew, verfe 22th, thefe words,
sine caufa, without a caufe, which were in the ancient Vulgar, and
 are to be found at prefent in the Syriac Verfion. He obferves never-
 thelefs. (a) that they were only in fome Copies; and he calls thofe the
 true, wherein they were not read; from whence he concludes that they
 ought to be Expunged out of the Text of the Latin Interpretation, *raden-*
dum eft ergo sine caufa. St. Auguftin who had read thefe words in
 his Latin Copy, admits the Correction of St. Jerom in his Retracti-
 ons. (b) We have (faith he) afterwards better underftood that which is
 here written, He that is angry with his Brother; for the Greek Copies
 have not without a caufe, as it is in the Latin: However I have not
 found any Greek Manufcript that confirms this remark of St. Auguftin,
 they all agree in this particular with the M S. of Cambridg and the
 ancient Vulgar; there is only the Greek Copy of the Vatican cited
 by *Lucas Brugensis*, wherein *εἰς* without a caufe is not read. It Luc. Brug.
 might happen that St. Auguftin thereupon confulted none but St. Jerom, Not. in
 who pofitively affirms that this word is not in the true Copies. cap. 5.
 Many learned Critics have not forbore to judg that it were moft Matth.
 convenient to preferve the words *sine caufa* in our Vulgar, becaufe
 they were in the ancient, that agrees in this with the greateft num-
 ber of Greek M S S. *Grotius*, who hath adhered to this Party, makes
 no difficulty to abandon St. Jerom herein, and to follow St. *Justin*, Grot.
Irenaeus, and the ancient Greek Authors that have written Com- Annot.
 mentaries on St. Matthew. But after all, it is probable that this in cap. 5.
 word *εἰς* is an addition of thefe Primitive Chriftians that had in- Matth.
 ferted fo many other things into the Gofpels, and that it remain-
 ed in the greateft part of the Greek Copies. St. Jerom might have
 affured us in this fenfe that it was not in the true Copies, for he
 chiefly confulted thofe that had been Revifed.

He hath Corrected, according to this method, the 36th verfe of
 the 24th Chapter of St. Matthew, wherein heretofore were thefe
 words, *Neque Filius, nor the Son*, as it is read in the Copy of Cam-

(a) In quibusdam codicibus additur sine caufa. Ceterum in veris definita fententia
 eft, & ita penitus tollitur. Hier. Comm. in cap. 5. Matth. v. 22.

(b) Illud etiam melius intelleximus poftea quod fcriptum eft, Qui irafcitur fratri fuo.
 Codices enim Graeci non habent sine caufa, ficut hic pofuimus eft. Aug. lib. 1. Retr.
 cap. 19.

Luc.
Brug. loc.
infig.
Rom.
Corr.
Matth.
cap. 24.
v. 36.

Nic.
Zeger.
Castig. in
N.T. cap.
23. v. 14.

Luc. Brug.
Correct.
Rom.
Matt. cap.
23. v. 14.

Chap. 30.

Colom.
Obfer.
Sac. p. 86.

bridg: (c) *These words (saith this learned Father) nor the Son, have been added in some Books, but they are not in the Greek, especially in the Copies of Origen and Pierius. The Censors of Rome have exactly followed this Criticism: Add not (saith Lucas Brugensis, referring to this place according to the Correction of Rome) nor the Son, because these words belong to St. Mark. Non interponas, Neque Filius, quod Marco proprium est. However Casaubon was of opinion with Erasmus, that they ought to be Re-established in the Text of St. Matthew, notwithstanding these critical Remarks of St. Jerom. Neither ought we to attribute to the reformation of this learned Critic, these words that are read at present in our Vulgar, and were not in the old Edition, Matth. Chap. 23. v. 14. Væ vobis, Scribæ & Pharisei hypocritæ, quia comeditis domos viduarum, orationes longas orantes; propter hoc amplius accipietis judicium. Wo unto you Scribes and Pharisees Hypocrites, for ye devour Widows Houses, and for a pretence make long Prayers; therefore ye shall receive greater damnation. It is certain that St. Jerom read them not, tho they have been since added to the Text of St. Matthew, that hath been Printed with his Commentary on this Evangelist. Zegerus, and after him Lucas Brugensis have judiciously observed that they are not in the most ancient and most correct Latin Copies; and that it appears from the Canons of Eusebius that he hath not read them in his Greek Copy; therefore Lucas Brugensis reckons this passage amongst those which the Censors of Rome have thought fit to retain, tho it seems that it ought to be retrenched, Et si hic (saith this Learned Author) videatur Marco & Luca proprius esse, non tamen judicarunt Correctores hic expungendum esse.*

There is a considerable addition in the 20th Chap. of St. Matthew, verse 28. in the Latin of the Manuscript of Cambridg, as well as in the Greek of that Copy: But since I have already discoursed thereof in the first Part of this Work, I shall only mention an observation that Colomesius hath made on this passage, who affirms that he hath found this same addition in the Poet Juvenus, who lived under the Reign of the Emperor Constantin, from whence he takes occasion to call it a fragment of St. Matthew, in hoc Matthæi fragmento, as if the present Greek Copies, our Vulgar, and even all the Oriental Versions were defective in this place; but this pretended fragment (as I have elsewhere shewed) was taken from the 14th Chapter of St. Luke. If the remark of Colomesius be true, it only proves thus much, that the Errors that St. Jerom hath Corrected in the Latin Edition of his time are very ancient, and that there was need

(c) *In quibusdam Latinis codicibus additum est neque filius, cum in Græcis, & maxime Adamantii & Pierii exemplaribus hoc non habeatur adscriptum. Hier. Comm. in cap. 24. Matth.*

of so able a Critic as that Father to restore it to a better condition.

It was heretofore read in the ancient vulgar, in the 21. Chap. of St. Matthew, v. 31. *Novissimus, the last*, as it is written in the Greek Copy of *Cambridg*, wherein there is the word *ἔσχατος*. But St. Jerom declares it to be a fault, and that it ought to be read *primus, the first*, Hier. as it is in the present vulgar, *Sciendum est* (saith he) *in veris exemplaribus non haberi novissimum, sed primum.* Comm. in c. 21. Matth.

It is worth the observing that St. Jerom hath altered many things in the Latin Copies, which are nevertheless found at this day in our vulgar, as they were in the ancient Edition, which hath caused divers learned Men of our time, especially those that have made new Latin Translations from the Greek, to believe that the vulgar that is at present read in all the Western Churches, is not the Edition of St. Jerom: But because I shall hereafter treat of this question in particular, I shall only discourse here concerning the *Italic* that was used before this Father Revised it.

He informs us in his Commentary on the 3d. Chap. of the Epistle of St. Paul to the *Galatians*, verse 1. where we now read, *Quis vos fascinavit non obedire, who hath bewitched you that you should not obey*; or (as he reads it) *credere veritati, believe the truth*; that he hath Expunged these words, because they were not in Origen's Copy. *Sed hoc, quia in exemplaribus Adamantii non habetur, omisimus.* Hier. This is to be understood of these last words, *Non obedire veritati, that you should not obey the Truth*, which indeed are not neither in the Greek nor in the Latin of the ancient Manuscript of the Abbey of St. *Germain des Pres*; nevertheless they have been added at the bottom of the page, as if the Transcriber had forgotten to write them: But no respect ought to be had to additions that have been inserted afterwards into this Copy, as also into that which is commonly called of *Clermont*, and is extant in the King's Library: The Revisers of the ancient Manuscripts, as shall be proved in the sequel of this Treatise, are the true Authors of these Additions. *Hilary* the Deacon and *Pelagius* have not read these same words, *non obedire veritati*, in their Edition. *Zegerus* and *Lucas Brugensis* have also taken notice that St. *Augustin*, St. *Chrysostom*, and the most part of the Greek Commentators have not read them. *Id quod etiam omittunt*, (saith *Zegerus*, *Ambrosius*, *Augustinus*, *Sedulius*, *ut hinc colligi possit a castigatore Ecclesiastico in nostris additum esse.* Zeger. Castig. in N. T. c. 3. Epist. ad Gal. *Lucas Brugensis* produceth (d) some Latin Copies wherein they were not contained, but they were afterwards annexed at the bottom of the Page; however *Erasmus* hath Gal.

(d) *Latium Paulinae bibliothecae antiquissimum exemplar in contextu non habuit, tantum procul in ima margine manu recentiore subnotatum.* Fr. Luc. Brug. Notat. in cap. 3. Epist. ad Gal.

Hier.
Comm in
cap. 5.
Epist. ad
Gal.

Tertull.
lib. de
Præscr
adv. Hæc.
cap. 27.

put them into the Text of this Epistle, Printed with St. Jerom's Commentary, altho this Father believed that they ought to be retrenched; neither are they in the Edition of *Marianus Victorius*. These very same words, *non obedire veritati*, are found in the 5th Chapter of the same Epistle, verse 7th, &c. It appears that St. Jerom believed that they were added to the Text in this place as well as in the former, *Quod quidem nos* (saith he) *in vetustis codicibus non haberi in suo loco annotavimus, licet & Græca exemplaria hoc errore circumfusa sint*. He confesseth that they were in the Greek Copies of his time; and indeed I have read them both in the Greek and in the Latin of the ancient Copy of St. Germain des Pres. Hilary the Deacon and Pelagius had them also in their Edition, and they declare it also in their Commentaries; but Tertullian who cites this passage in his Book of Prescription against the Heretics, doth not relate them; in which he seems to confirm the Opinion of St. Jerom, because he there exhibits the two places of the Epistle to the Galatians that are now in dispute.

Zeger.
Castig. in
N. T. c. 2.
Epist. ad
Gal. v. 5.

This Father hath likewise observed on these words of the second Chapter, verse 5th, *Quibus neque ad horam cessimus*, to whom we gave place, no not for an hour, as it is read at present according to his Correction from the Greek, that they were expressed in the Latin Copies of his time without the Negative Particle, *Quibus ad horam cessimus*, to whom we gave place for an hour: I have found this same reading in the Copy of St. Germain and in that of Clermont, which is the same Hilary the Deacon, who maintains this reading of the ancient Latin-Interpreter, subjoins at the same time that the Grecians read on the contrary, *Nec ad horam cessimus*. St. Jerom hath explained this passage in his Commentary according to both readings, *Si Latini*, (saith he) *exemplaris alicui fides placet*, &c. Nevertheless he prefers the other reading that was inserted in the Vulgar, because it was conformable to the Original. But Zegerus wisheth that our Vulgar were Corrected in this place from the ancient Latin Edition that is confirmed by St. Irenæus and Tertullian, *Quam lectionem* (saith this Critic) *optarim recipi ab Ecclesia*. He sets a greater value on the authority of these two ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, than on that of St. Jerom and St. Augustin; this last having in like manner read this passage with the Particle *Neque*, no not, altho it was not in the ancient Latin Edition.

It was read in some Copies of the *Italic* in the time of St. Jerom in the 5th Chapter of this same Epistle, verse the 7th, *Nemini consenseritis*, you should consent to none. Pelagius Expounds these same words in his Commentary on this place; but St. Jerom had reason to take them out of the Latin Text, since he could not find them neither in the Greek, nor in the Ecclesiastical Writers that had written Annotations on this Epistle before him, *Sed quia* (saith this

Father

Father) *nec in Gracis libris, nec in his qui in Apostolum commentati sunt* Hier. in c. hoc Scriptum invenimus, praterendum videtur. To which it may be added, 5. Epist. ad Gal. that they were not found in all the Copies of the ancient Latin Edition, since Hilary the Deacon doth not mention them; neither are they in the Greek nor in the Latin of the Manuscript of St. Germain. Zegerus conjectures that the Heretics had retrenched them from the Text of St. Paul, before the time of St. Jerom; but this Conjecture hath no Foundation.

In this same place of the Epistle to the Galatians, where it is written conformably to the Greek Text, *persuasio hac non est ex eo qui vocat vos*, This perswasion cometh not of him that calleth you. St. Jerom Epistle to the Gal. c. 5. v. 8. hath remarked that it was read in the Latin Copies of his time, *Persuasio vestra ex Deo est qui vocavit vos*, Your perswasion is from God that hath called you; which he judgeth to be a fault arising from the resemblance of the words *ex eo*, and *ex Deo*. It is in the ancient Vulgar of the Copy of St. Germain, *Suasio ex eo est qui vos vocat*. But forasmuch as the Greek of this Copy agrees with the present, it is evident that the ancient Latin Interpretation was not well corrected in this place; therefore St. Jerom adds, that altho *ex eo* were read instead of *ex Deo*; yet the sense would not be clear, because the Negative Particle that belongs to the Text hath been taken away. *Melius igitur* (saith he) *& verius sic legitur*: *Persuasio vestra non est ex eo qui vocavit vos*. It appears from the Commentaries of Hilary the Deacon and Pelagius on this place, that they have also read the Negative Particle in their Latin Copy; but instead of *ex eo*, they seem to have read *ex Deo*, which doth not alter the sense. St. Jerom ascribes this alteration of the Latin Copies (e) to the simplicity of some well meaning People who thought to Honour God by making him the Author of our perswasions; which gave them occasion to take away the Negative Particle from the Text of St. Paul; and they have thereby made the sense quite contrary to that of the Apostle: The Opinions with which we are perswaded (adds this Learned Father) ought not to be attributed to God nor to the Devil; for they come not from him that hath called us, but from our selves, who give or deny our consent to him that calls us. Hier. ibid.

It plainly appears from what hath been now alledged, and from divers other observations of St. Jerom, that he hath revised the ancient Latin Edition, not only in the Gospels, but also in the Epistles of St. Paul: Nevertheless our Vulgar doth not always exactly follow his alterations, as appears from the ensuing words in this same Epistle

(e) *Simpliciores quique putantes se deferre Deo, si persuasio quoque nostra in ejus sit potestate, abstulerunt partem orationis non, & sensum contrarium Apostolo reddidere. Sive ergo in bonam, sive in malam partem, nec Deus nec Diabolus in causa est, quia persuasio nostra non est ex eo qui vocavit nos, sed ex nobis, qui vel consentimus, vel non consentimus vocanti.* Hier. Comm. in c. 5. Epist. ad Gal.

to the *Galatians*. (f) It is read amiss (saith this Father) in our Copies, a little Leaven corrupterth the whole Lump; insomuch that the Interpreter hath rather Translated the sense than the expression of the Apostle: Therefore he reads *Modicum fermentum totam consersionem fermentat*, A little Leaven leaveneth the whole Lump. This reading which he disapproves is certainly that of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter that is preserved in our *Vulgar*, and is also represented by *Hilary* the Deacon and *Pelagius*: Moreover I have seen it in the ancient Copy of *Clermont* that is in the King's Library, wherein it is read in the *Latin*, *Corrumpit*, and in the *Greek*, *δαλῶ*; but the Revisers of this Copy have blotted out *δαλῶ* and put *ζυμῶ* in its place, which is the reading that *St. Jerom* believed to be Authentic. I have already observed in the first Part of this Work, that the former reading was in *Marcion's* Copy.

In the same Chapter, verse 13. *St. Jerom* hath not read the word *Spiritus*, of the Spirit; but simply per *Charitatem*, by Love. *Zegerus* who was of Opinion that the *Latin* Translation of the Epistles of *St. Paul*, hath been Corrected by some other Ecclesiastical Writer, conjectures that this Author hath added the word *Spiritus* in the *Vulgar*, and that he took it from the Version of *St. Ambrose*, that is to say, of *Hilary* the Deacon, *Addubito* (saith this Critic) num & hoc N.T.c. 5. *adjectivum sit ab eo qui correctorem egit Novi Instrumenti ex ea Versione Epist. ad Gal. qua usus est Ambrosius, quem sequitur & Sedulius*. But his Doubt is without any good grounds, for the Version that he mentions is the Ancient, which *Pelagius* also produceth in this place. This same word *Spiritus*, is likewise found in the *Latin* of the Manuscript of *St. Germain*, and we read in the *Greek* of this MS. according to the *Latin* τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῷ πνεύματι.

In the 19th verse of this same Chapter of the Epistle to the *Galatians*, *St. Jerom* hath remarked that in the ancient *Latin* Copies these words were read, *Adultery*, *Uncleanness* and *Murders*, which he hath retrenched. In *Latinis codicibus* (saith this learned Critic) *adulterium quoque, & impudicitia & homicidia in hoc catalogo vitiorum scripta referuntur; sed sciendum non plus quam quindecim carnis opera nominata*. He reads only in this passage, *Fornicatio*, *Immundicitia*, *Luxuria*, *Fornication*, *Uncleanness*, *Luxury*; whereas in our *Vulgar* where the word *Adulterium* *Adultery* hath been expunged that was in the *Italic*, the word *Impudicitia* *Uncleanness* is retained, which this Father had banished. I have seen this same word in the *Latin* Edition of the Copy of *St. Germain*, as also the word *Adulteria* before *Fornicatio*; but *Luxuria*, which is in the *Vulgar*, is not in this M S. It is cer-

(f) Male in nostris codicibus habetur, Modicum fermentum totam massam corrumpit, & sensum potius Interpreter suum, quam verba Apostoli transiit. Hier. ibid.

tain that that which St. Jerom thought fit to take away from the ancient Latin Copies was only a gloss. Nevertheless we read in all the Greek Copies, *μοιχεία*, Adultery; but it is probable that this word hath been afterwards inserted therein, and that the Apostle comprehended under the word *μοιχεία* Adultery, as well as simple Fornication. Hilary the Deacon hath read thus in his Latin Copy, *Adulterium, Fornicatio, Impuritas, Obscœnitas, Idololatria*, which agrees with the Copy of St. Germain.

There is also a difference between the Latin Copies in the 22d verse of this same Chapter; wherein the Fruits of the Spirit are Related; St. Jerom makes mention only of nine of these Fruits in his Edition and in his Commentary conformably to the Greek Text; whereas there are twelve in the present Vulgar. Pelagius hath likewise read twelve, which he explains in his Annotations, saving that he seems to take these two words, *Benignitas & Bonitas*, to be Synonymous, having comprised them under one Explication. Hilary specified but ten, having inverted their order; and it appears from his Commentary that he hath acknowledged that no more ought to be read, *Non amplius* (saith he) *quam decem res posuit, quas fructus Spiritus significat*. These two Authors reckon Chastity amongst the Fruits of the Spirit, as it is also in our Vulgar. Pelagius affirms in his Commentary on this place, that Continency ought to be understood of Spiritual Marriage, and Chastity of Virgins, *Continentia in conjugis spiritualibus, castitas in virginibus intelligitur*. This same word *Castitas* is found in the Latin of the ancient Copy of St. Germain: The word *ἀγνεία* is likewise read after *ἐννεγρέα* in the Greek of this Manuscript, which the Reviser hath blotted out to adapt it to the Copies of his time. It is easy to judg that there are Synonymous words in the Latin; as for example, *Benignitas, Gentleness, and Bonitas, Goodness*, signify the same thing; the former (as I remember) is not in the Manuscript of St. Germain; nevertheless they are distinguished in all the Greek Copies, as well as in the Latin Edition of St. Jerom. Hilary hath placed the Word *Bonitas* last, which variation hath caused me to conjecture that it was not in some Copies. The words *patientia & longanimitas*, *patience and long-suffering*, are manifestly Synonymous, though they are contained in our Vulgar and in the Edition of Pelagius, as two different Fruits of the Spirit. Hilary reads only *longanimitas, long-suffering*, but he hath added *spes, hope*, which seems to be the same thing, at least, as to the sense. Lastly, our Vulgar and Pelagius have in like manner accounted *mansuetudo & modestia, meekness and modesty*, two Fruits of the Spirit, which nevertheless are but one. Hilary hath read *lenitas* in the places of these two words, which is also in the Copy of St. Germain instead of *modestia*: However it is much more probable that in the beginning *ἐννεγρέα* was only read in the Greek, and

and *Continentia* in the *Latin*: The word ἀγνεία that is in the *Greek* of the Manuscript of *St. Germain*, and *castitas*, that answers thereto in the *Latin*, appears to be a Gloss or Interpretation of the *Greek* word ἐγκρατεία.

Besides these various readings that we have now observed in the Epistle to the *Galatians*, *St. Jerom* in his Commentary on this Epistle reproves the ancient *Latin* Interpreter (g) for reading in the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 13. verse 3. *Ut ardeam*, to be burned, instead of *glorier*, to boast; he asserts that this Error happened, because the word καὶ δῖσομαι, was mistaken for καυχῆσομαι, but confesseth nevertheless that the *Greek* Copies differ in this particular: But the *Roman* Censors have had no regard to his Criticism, for it is read *Ardeam* at this day in the *Vulgar*, as it was heretofore in that of his time; neither have I seen any Copy wherein καὶ δῖσομαι, *Ardeam* is not expressed, as it is in the *Greek* and *Latin* of the Manuscript of *St. Germain*. The *Greek* Bible, Printed at *Frankfort* by *Wekel*, is only produced to prove this reading; but it is likely that *Junius*, who is the Author of the Collection of various readings annexed thereto, hath taken it from *St. Jerom's* Remark.

Lastly, *St. Jerom* hath observed in his Commentary on the sixth Chapter of the Epistle of *St. Paul* to the *Galatians* verse 1st. that instead of *in Spiritu mansuetudinis*, which was in the ancient Version, it might be better Translated according to the *Greek*, *in Spiritu lenitatis*. Our *Vulgar* admits this reading; but the Manuscript of *St. Germain* and *Hilary* the Deacon agree with the ancient *Vulgar*. *Pelagius* hath also read it after the same manner, tho he is made to read it as it is in our *Vulgar* in the Text that is adjoyned to his Commentary.

C H A P. V.

Wherein the particular Examination of the ancient Latin Version of the New Testament, called the Italic, is continued.

THE various readings above specified plainly shew that these two ancient *Greek* and *Latin* MSS. which have been so often mentioned in this Work, contain in the *Latin* Text the *Italic* Version of the Epistles of *S. Paul* that were used in the *Western-Churches* before the time of *S. Jerom*: This evidently appears from the con-

(g) Ob similitudinem verbi qua apud Græcos ardeam & glorier; id est, καυχῆσομαι & καὶ δῖσομαι, una literæ parte distinguuntur, apud nos error inolevit: sed & apud ipsos Græcos exemplaria sunt diversa. Hier. Comm. in c. 5. Epist. ad Gal.

formity that there is between these two venerable Manuscripts, and the Critical Remarks of this Father on the ancient *Latin* Edition: Moreover it hath been proved that they generally agree with *Pelagius* and *Hilary* the Deacon, who were the Contemporaries of *St. Jerom*. Forasmuch as we have the Commentaries of these three learned Writers on other Epistles of *St. Paul*, it will not be amiss to exhibit some examples of the Variations, with an intent to give a more particular and full Account of the *Italic* Version that hath been so famous in the Primitive Ages of the Church, and is thought at this day to be almost lost.

I shall observe first in general, that the *Latin* of the two Copies above-mentioned is conformable almost in every particular to the Edition of *Hilary* the Deacon. The *Latin* Text it self that hath been Printed with the Commentaries of *St. Jerom*, doth very often agree with the *Italic*: As for example, we read in all, Chap. i. v. 3. of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, which we shall now examin, these words, *Prædestinans & Placitum*, *Predestinating and Pleasure*, instead of, *qui Prædestinavit & Propositum*, *who hath Predestinated and Purpose*, that are in our *Vulgar*: But my design not being to insist on punctilios, I shall immediately apply my self to those Places, wherein there are more considerable variations than these.

St. Jerom declares that it was read in the 1st. Chapter of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, verse 6. in the ancient *Latin* Edition, *in dilecto filio suo*, in his beloved Son, but that it ought to be read simply, *in dilecto*, in the beloved. *Nec putandum* (saith this Father) *quod in Latinis codicibus habetur scriptum esse*, in dilecto filio suo; *sed simpliciter*, in dilecto. *Hilary* and *Pelagius* have had also in their *Latin* Edition, *in dilecto filio suo*; and I have found these same words as well in the Greek as in the *Latin* of the Manuscript of *St. Germain*, which have been preserved in our *Vulgar*, notwithstanding the correction of *St. Jerom* that is consonant to all the *Greek* Copies, wherein it is read only *ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ*. But the Manuscript of *Clermont* that is in the King's Library and that of the Abby of *St. Germain des Pres* add *τῷ υἱῷ ἀγαπῶ*, and in the *Latin* *Filio suo*. *Zeger* conjectures after his usual manner, that he that Revised the *Vulgar*, hath inserted these words therein, which he found in the ancient Edition of *St. Ambrose*, or rather of *Hilary* the Deacon; but there seems to be a much greater probability that they were retained, because they were in the ancient *Latin* Translation.

In the 5th Verse of this same Chapter, we read in the *Latin* of the Manuscript of *St. Germain*, *Placitum*, *Pleasure*; which reading is confirmed by *Hilary*, and even by the Text adjoyned to the Commentary of *St. Jerom*, who affirms that the *Greek* word *εὐδονία* would be better Translated by *Beneplacitum*, *good pleasure*. This alteration is followed in our *Vulgar* in the 9th verse, where the same word *εὐδονία*

is found, whereas it is put here *propositum, purpose*: But the ancient Latin Interpreter observes a greater uniformity, inserting the word *placitum* in both these places.

It is remarked by St. Jerom in the 10th verse, that the word *instaurare, to repair or restore*, that was used by the ancient Latin Interpreter, and is yet retained in our Vulgar, doth not altogether answer to the Greek Verb ἀνακατασκευάζειν, which properly signifies *Recapitulare, summarily to repeat or gather together*. Pro recapitulare (saith this Father) in Latinis Codicibus Scriptum est instaurare; & mi-
 Hier. ibid. Tertull. ror cur ipso verbo Græco non usi sint translatore. Tertullian had Tran-
 lib. 5. adv. slated it after this same manner a great while before him in his writ-
 Marc. c. 17. ings against Marcion.

It is not read in the 11th. verse of this same 1st. Chapter, *nos sorte vocati sumus, we are chosen by lot*, in the Copy of St. Germain, as it is in our vulgar, according to the Greek Text; but only *Vocati sumus, we are called*. The Greek of this Manuscript answers to the Latin; for it is written therein ἐκλήθημεν, and not ἐκκληρώθημεν, as it is read at present in all the Greek Copies, except the ancient *Alexandrian*, which hath also ἐκλήθημεν. Hilary the Deacon, who hath read in his Version, *sortiti sumus*, hath literally expressed the Verb ἐκκληρώθημεν. The said Deacon, and the Copy of St. Germain have in the same place *Dei, of God*, instead of *Ejus, of him*; therefore it is read also in the Greek of this Manuscript, ἐκ θεοῦ.

Where we read in our Vulgar, verse 14th, *acquisitionis, of the Possession*; it was in the ancient Latin Version, *adoptionis, of the Adoption*, as St. Jerom intimates in this place, when he shews (a) that *υιοθεσία*, that signifies *Adoption*, is not in the Greek, but *παιδοποίησις*, that may be rendred *aquisition or possession*; he subjoyns that this Translation doth not sufficiently express the force of the Greek word. The reading of the ancient Vulgar is found in the Manuscript of St. Germain: Nevertheless Hilary and Pelagius have read *acquisitionis* according to St. Jerom's Correction.

Moreover I have read in this same Manuscript, verse 19th, *Vos qui credidistis, you that have believed*; whereas it is in our Vulgar conformably to the Greek, *Nos qui credimus, us who believe*. The Greek of the Copy of St. Germain answers the Latin, for we read therein ὑμεῖς, which the Reviser hath changed into ἐγώ, to suit it to the received reading of his time. Hilary who reads in his Edition, *Vos qui creditis*, confirms the reading of the ancient Latin Interpreter that is in the Manuscript of St. Germain.

(a) In eo ubi ait, in redemptionem adoptionis, non habet in Græco υιοθεσία, sed παιδοποίησις, quam nos acquisitionem sive possessionem possumus dicere, nec tamen vim sermonis expressimus. Hier. Comm. in c. 1. Epist. ad Ephes.

It is read in this same Copy, at the 22th verse, *Omnia Ecclesia, all things to the Church*, according to all the Greek Copies, except that of the *Marquess de Véles*. St. Jerom also maintains this reading in his *Commentary*; nevertheless it is in our *Vulgar, Omnem Ecclesiam, the whole Church*, which is conformable in this to *Pelagius* and *Hilary the Deacon*.

In the 2d Chapter of this same Epistle to the *Ephesians*, verse 3d, it is in the *Latin* of the Manuscript of *St. Germain*, in concupiscentia, in the Lust; where we read in our *Vulgar*, and in the Edition of *Hilary*, in desiderijs, in the Desires, according to the Greek Text: But *Hilary* and the Copy of *St. Germain* read in this place voluptates & consiliorum, pleasures and of the Counsels; whereas it is in our *Vulgar*, voluntates & cogitationum, wills and of the thoughts. They agree also in the 4th verse, where instead of these words of the *Vulgar*, Propter nimiam charitatem suam qua dilexit nos, for his great Love wherewith he loved us; they have, propter (the MSS. of *St. Germain* per) multam caritatem misertus est Nostri, for his great love he had compassion of us.

In the 5th verse of the same Chapter, where it is read in the ordinary Greek $\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$, it is in the Manuscript of *Clermont*, $\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$; which agrees better with the word peccatis, that is in our *Vulgar*, according to the ancient *Latin* Version. St. Jerom seems to have read both these words in the Greek, because he produceth them in his *Commentary* where he Translates them by Delicta & Peccata, Trespasses and Sins, and explains the difference between $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ and $\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$. The Reviser of the Manuscript of *St. Germain* hath blotted out $\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, to adapt it to the Greek reading, that was common in his time; but the word Peccatis is inserted in the *Latin*. In the same 5th verse it is written in the MSS. of *Clermont* and *St. Germain* as in the present *Vulgar*, cujus gratia, by whose grace; the Greek of both these Copies being agreeable to the *Latin* hath $\tau\eta\ \chi\alpha\acute{\rho}\iota\tau\iota$. *Hilary* and *Pelagius*, who have also read in their Edition, cujus gratia, confirm this ancient reading.

Where we read in the vulgar, verse 8th, gratia enim estis salvati, for by grace are ye saved, conformably to the Greek Text, it is written in the *Latin* of the Manuscript of *St. Germain*, Nam gratia ejus salvi facti sumus, for we are saved by his Grace; and in the Greek, according to this reading, $\tau\eta\ \chi\alpha\acute{\rho}\iota\tau\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\alpha\acute{\rho}\iota\tau\iota\ \sigma\epsilon\omega\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\upsilon$. Besides there is Nobis instead of Vobis, and $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in the Greek.

We do not find, verse 11th, in the *Latin* of the Manuscript of *St. Germain*, nor in the Edition of *Hilary*, propter quod, wherefore, as it is in our *Vulgar*: Moreover, instead of the Imperative memores estote, remember, *Hilary* expresseth it in the Particle memoria retinentes, remembring, and the Copy of *St. Germain* memoriam habentes. The Particle quod that is in the vulgar, is also omitted in both the above-mentioned Copies.

Instead of these words, *decretis evacuans*, that are in our Vulgar in the 15th verse, it is written in the *Latin* of the Manuscript of St. Germain, *in edictis destituens*.

St. Jerom believed (a) that instead of *in semetipso*, in himself that was in the ancient vulgar, and is now read in the present, verse 16th. it ought to be Translated, *in ea*, thereby; his reason is, because the pronoun that is ambiguous in the Greek, ought to be appropriated to the preceeding word *Crucem*, the Cross, which being of the feminine gender, takes away all ambiguity in the *Latin*; nevertheless his critical Remark hath not been regarded in our Vulgar. Hilary confirms the ancient Version in his Commentary on this place, wherein in he saith, speaking of Jesus Christ, *Interfecit inimicitiam in se*, dum pro omnibus tam Judeis quam Gentilibus mortuus est, He slew

Ambro-
sian.

Comm. in

cap. 2.

Epist. ad

Ephes.

the Enmity in himself, whilst he died for all, as well Jews as Gentiles.

All the Greek Copies at this day have the word *ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ* but once in the 17th verse; but it is written twice in the Greek of the Manuscript of St. Germain, as also in the *Latin*, *Pacem*, Peace, which our vulgar hath retained from the ancient *Latin* Interpreter.

It is read in the 20th verse of this 2d Chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, in the *Latin* of the Manuscript of St. Germain, *Cum sit angularis lapis ipse Jesus Christus*, since Jesus Christ himself is the corner-stone. The word *λίθον* is also found in this Manuscript, which is not read in the other Greek Copies, except in that of Clermont, which is the same as the other of St. Germain. The word *Lapis* is likewise preserved in our Vulgar.

The word *πρὸς θεόν*, hath been added after *ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ*, in the 3d Chap. of the same Epistle, verse 1st, in the Greek Manuscript of St. Germain; and it is read also in the *Latin* conformably to the Greek, *Postulo*, demand, which seems to have been inserted to make good the sense that is imperfect; but it is not in the Copy of Pelagius, nor in that of Hilary the Deacon.

It is read in all the Greek Copies, verse 9th, *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, by Jesus Christ: But these words are not found in the Greek nor in the *Latin* of our ancient Copy; neither have St. Jerom, Hilary, nor Pelagius mentioned them; our Version hath in this followed the ancient reading.

St. Jerom hath observed on the 14th verse, (b) That it ought not to be read as it was in the *Latin* Copies of his time, and as it is in

(a) Per crucem, interficiens inimicitiam in ea; non ut in Latinis codicibus habetur, in semetipso, propter Græci pronomini ambiguitatem. Ἐν αὐτῷ enim ὁ in semetipso, & in ea, id est, cruce, intelligi potest: quia crux, id est, sacrificium, juxta Græcos generis masculini est. Hier. Comm. in c. 2. Epist. ad Ephes.

(b) Non ut in Latinis codicibus additum est, ad Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, sed simpliciter ad Patrem legendum, ut Dei Patris nomen, non Domino nostro Jesu Christo, sed omnibus creaturis rationalibus coaptetur. Hier. Comm. in c. 3. Epist. ad Ephes.

the present, *Ad Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, To the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*; but only, *ad Patrem, to the Father*; insomuch that the word *Father*, is not to be understood in this place of the Father of *Jesu Christ*, but in general of all reasonable Creatures. Nevertheless these words are found not only in the two ancient *Greek* and *Latin* Copies of *Clermont* and *St. Germain*, and in the Edition of *Hilary* and *Pelagius*, but also in all those that are extant at this day, except the *Alexandrian*, wherein it is not read διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

It is read in the 20th verse in our *Vulgar*, *omnia, all*, according to the *Latin* of the Manuscripts of *St. Germain* and *Clermont*, that have also in the *Greek* the word πάντα simply; but *St. Jerom* reads *super omnia, above all*, which reading is consonant to all the present *Greek* Copies wherein it is written ὑπὲρ πάντα.

These words in the 21st verse, that are in our *Vulgar* Edition, and in that of *St. Jerom*, *In omnes generationes seculi seculorum; Throughout all generations, world without end*, are more conformable to the *Greek*, than these that are in the *Latin* of the Manuscript of *St. Germain*, *In omnia secula, Throughout all ages*.

In the 14th Chapter, verse 9th, where we read in our *Vulgar*, *Primum in inferiores partes, first into the lower parts*, it is written simply in the *Latin* of both the Manuscripts of *St. Germain* and *Clermont*, *in inferiora*: Neither are these words read in the *Greek* of these two Copies, πρῶτον & μέν. *Hilary* and *St. Jerom* have followed this ancient reading.

Instead of the word *circumventionem, Circum-vention*, which is in our *Vulgar*, verse 14th, it is written *remedium, remedy*, in the *Latin* of Manuscript of *St. Germain*: *Hilary* and *Pelagius* have read this passage after the same manner in their Version, seeing that the reading of the *vulgar* hath been inserted in the Text that is annexed to the Commentary of the later.

St. Jerom observes on the 19th verse of this Chapter, where he read (c) in the ancient Edition, *qui desperantes, who despairing*, as it is in the *vulgar* at this day; that it was expressed otherwise in the *Greek*, viz. ἀπὸ λυγρότερος, which signifies *being void of sorrow*, and not ἀπὸ ληκρότερος, as ought to be read according to the version of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter. Indeed all the *Greek* Copies extant at present have with *St. Jerom*, ἀπὸ λυγρότερος. But in the two ancient Manuscripts of *Clermont* and *St. Germain* it is written ἀπὸ ληκρότερος. *Hilary* and *Pelagius* read also in their Edition, *desperantes*, according to this ancient reading.

(c) Απὸ λυγρότερος multo aliud in Græco significat, quam in Latino. Desperantes quippe ἀλλήκροτες nominantur. Απὸ λυγρότερος autem hi sunt, qui postquam peccaverint, non dolent. Hier. Comm. in c. 4. Epist. ad Ephes.

In the 22d verse, where it is in our Vulgar, *desideria erroris*, it is read in the Manuscript of St. Germain, *concupiscentiam seductionis*, and in the Greek, *τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν*, in the singular number; but it is written *τὰς ἐπιθυμίας*, in the plural in all the other Greek Manuscripts.

Hier.
ibid.

St. Jerom declares that he hath altered the expression of the ancient Edition in the 29th verse, reading it thus, *ad adificationem opportunitatis*, to answer to the Greek Text, wherein the word *χρῆμα* is used; whereas the ancient Interpreter (as he affirms) had changed the word *opportunitas*, *opportunity*, into that of *Fidei*, *Faith*. But we read in the Greek of the two Manuscripts of St. Germain and Clermont *πίστεως*, and in the Latin, *Fidei*. Lucas Brugensis hath remarked on this place, that the most part of the Latin Copies have *Fidei*, as it is in the present Vulgar; nevertheless, that he hath read *opportunitatis* in two very ancient Manuscripts, according to the Correction of St. Jerom; and that he found in four other Copies, *ad adificationem opportunitatis*.

Chap. 5th, verse 4th, we read in the Vulgar with two disjunctive particles, *aut turpitude*, *aut stultiloquium*, or filthiness, or foolish talking; it is also in the Greek of the Manuscript of St. Germain, *ἢ ἀσέβειαν, ἢ ἀλογισίαν*; whereas the conjunctive particle *καὶ*, is found in these two places in all the other Greek Copies, except that of Alexandria. Hilary and Pelagius have likewise read the disjunctive particle *aut*, in their Version. It is worth the observing here, that the MSS. do often vary in these kinds of particles, making use indifferently of *καὶ* & *ἢ*, infomuch that the disputes that have been sometimes raised on occasion of this diversity of reading, are not very well grounded.

In the 9th verse, where it is in the greatest part of the Greek Copies, *καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος*, the fruit of the Spirit, it is read in the ancient Manuscript of Clermont, *καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός*, and in the Latin, *fructus luminis*, the fruit of the light, which agrees with our Vulgar, where it is *fructus lucis*; St. Jerom, Pelagius and Hilary, have read it no otherwise.

In the 14th verse, instead of these words that are in our Vulgar, *Illuminabit te Christus*, Christ shall enlighten thee, according to the Greek Text; it is in the Latin of the Manuscript of St. Germain, and in the Edition of Hilary the Deacon, *Continges Christum*, thou shalt touch Christ. This passage was read in these Versions after the same manner as it is in the Copy of Clermont, *ἐπαύ' ἡς ἃ Χρῆς*, and not *ἐπαύσσει σοι ὁ Χρῆς*, as we find it in all the other Greek Copies.

In the 19th verse, the word *spiritualibus*, *spiritual*, is not read in the Latin of the Copy of St. Germain, nor in the Version of Hilary; but it is in that of St. Jerom and in our Vulgar, conformably to the present Greek Copies.

Instead

Instead of the word θεῷ, of God, which is in the ordinary Greek, verse 21st, we find in the Manuscripts of St. Germain and Clermont, ~~Χριστῷ~~ Ἰησοῦ, and in the Latin of these two Copies, *Christi Jesu*, of Christ Jesus; it is also read in our Vulgar, *Christi*, according to the Editions of St. Jerom, Pelagius, and Hilary the Deacon. This manner of changing the words θεῷ and Χριστῷ, is usual in the Manuscripts.

St. Jerom observes contrary to the present reading in all Greek Copies, verse 22d, (d) that these words *subditæ sint*, be subject, are not in the Greek Text: Nevertheless in the Latin Manuscript of St. Germain we find, *subditæ estote viris vestris*, be ye subject unto your Husbands. Hilary and Pelagius have also read *subditæ sint*.

We do not read, verse 24th, the word ἰδίοις in the Greek of the Manuscripts of St. Germain and Clermont, nor *suis*, their own, in the Latin, but the Greek is thus expressed therein, ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅπως καὶ αἱ ἑαυτῆς τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν παντί.

The word *vita*, of Life, that is in our Vulgar, verse 26th, is not read in the Latin of the Manuscript of St. Germain, nor in the Version of Hilary; and indeed it is not found in any Greek Copy, nor in the best and most ancient Latin MSS. therefore it seems to be convenient that it should be taken away out of the Vulgar; but the Censors of Rome have not thought fit to expunge it. *Correctores* (saith Lucas Brugensis) *judicarunt non auferendum in fine nomen vita.*

In the Greek Text of the two Manuscripts of St. Germain and Clermont, the particle ἵνα, is read in the 33d verse, after the word ὡς ἵνα; but this is a fault of the Transcriber; for *ut*, that, is not expressed in the Latin: This passage is thus written in these two Copies, being somewhat different from the ordinary Greek; καὶ ὡς ἵνα ἵνα ἑαυτοῖς ἐαυτῆς ἑαυτῆς ὡς ἑαυτοῖς ἀγαπάτω. Moreover instead of these words that are in our Vulgar, *Uxor autem timeat virum*, it is written in the Latin of these two ancient Manuscripts, *Mulier timeat virum*, which expression is likewise read after the same manner in the Version of Hilary the Deacon.

In the 6th Chapter of the same Epistle to the Ephesians, verse 1. We do not read in the Greek of the Manuscript of Clermont, ἐν κυρίῳ, nor in the Latin, in Domino, in the Lord; neither hath Hilary read this word in his Translation; but it evidently appears from the Commentaries of St. Jerom and Pelagius that it was in their Edition, and indeed it is found in all the Greek Copies that are now extant.

It is written in the Greek of the Manuscript of Clermont, ver. 9th, μετὰ θεῷ, and in the Latin, *apud Deum*, with God, instead of παρ' αὐτῷ

(d) Hoc quod in Latinis exemplaribus additum est subditæ sint, in Græcis codicibus non habetur. Siquidem ad superiora refertur & subauditur. Hier. Comm. in c. 5. Epist. ad Eph.

that is in the ordinary Copies, and *apud eum*, with him, in the Vulgar. Hilary confirms the ancient reading, *apud Deum*; he also omits the word *fratres*, brethren, in the following verse, that is inserted in our Vulgar; agreeing in this particular with the two Manuscripts of St. Germain and Clermont, which have not ἀδελφοί μὲν, nor *fratres* in the Latin.

The word αἰώνες, *Age*, that is in the 12th verse in the most part of the Greek Copies, is not read in the Manuscript of Clermont. Our Vulgar hath preserved this ancient reading which is established by St. Jerom, Pelagius, and Hilary.

We do not find in the Greek of the two Copies of Clermont and St. Germain, verse 14th, οὕτως ἐν, that is in all the other Greek Copies, nor in the Latin of these two MSS. *State ergo*, stand therefore, as it is in our Vulgar: Neither hath Hilary read these words in his Edition, but they are in that of St. Jerom and Pelagius.

The word λαβεῖς is not read in the Greek of these same MSS. verse 17th which is in all the other Greek Copies, nor *assume*, take, that is in our Vulgar. Hilary agrees thereupon with these ancient Manuscripts.

We read, verse 18th, in the Greek of these two Copies, εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγρυπνοῦντες πάντοτε ἐν παντὶ τῇ δεήσει ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, and in the Latin, according to this reading, *In illo vigilantes semper in omni observatione (obsecratione) pro omnibus sanctis*, watching thereunto always in all supplication for all Saints.

For the better Discovering and Illustrating the *Italic* or ancient vulgar Translation, I shall here subjoyn certain observations taken from the Epistles of St. Paul to Titus and Philemon, on which we also have the Commentaries of St. Jerom, of Hilary the Deacon, and of Pelagius.

In the 1st Chapter and the 4th verse of the Epistle to Titus, we do not find in the two Manuscripts of Clermont and St. Germain the word ἐλεος, *mercy*, which is in all the other Greek Copies; our vulgar is conformable to this to the ancient Latin Interpreter, St. Jerom, Pelagius, and Hilary the Deacon.

We do not find μὲν, verse 16th, in the Greek of these Manuscripts, and it is not inserted in the Latin, nor in our vulgar; neither is this particle in the Editions of St. Jerom, Hilary, and Pelagius, but it is found in all the other Greek Copies, except the *Alexandrian*.

In the 2d Chapter, verse 5th, the word *sobrias*, sober, that is in our vulgar, is not found in the Latin of the Manuscript of St. Germain, nor in any other Greek Copy, except that of the Marquess de Veles; St. Jerom doth not read it, but he hath substituted the word *pudicas*, modest, in the room of *prudentes*, prudent. Hilary hath these two last words in his Edition, but doth not insert *sobrias*; this last word hath been added to the Text that is annexed to the Commentary

tary of *Pelagius*, and it is probable that it was taken from our *Vulgar*. This diversity of our *Latin* Copies proceeds from the *Greek* word *σάφους*, which hath been differently Translated; and we may justly attribute to this, several Glosses that are in our *Latin* Edition in this place.

The *Vulgar* doth not express the word *ἀσθασία*, *uncorruptedness* in the 7th verse, that is in the greatest part of the *Greek* Copies; neither is it found in the Manuscripts of *St. Germain* and *Clermont*, nor in the *Latin* that is adjoynd to them: *St. Jerom* hath in this place changed the word *gravitate*, *gravity*, that is in the *Latin* of the M.S. of *St. Germain*, and in the Versions of *Hilary* and *Pelagius*, into *castitate*, *chastity*; but the former reading is retained in our *Vulgar*, which is that of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, and suits very well with the *Greek* word *σεμνότης*.

In the 14th verse, where we read in the *Vulgar*, *acceptabilem*, *acceptable*, it is expressed in the *Latin* of the Manuscript of *St. Germain*, and in the Edition of *Hilary* the Deacon, *abundantem*, *abundant*; the *Greek* word is *περιούσιον*; in the explication whereof *St. Jerom* very much enlarges, Interpreting it *egregium*, *egregious* or *excellent*, in his Commentary; but the word *acceptabilem* hath been inserted in the Text that is joyned to the Commentary of *Pelagius*, as also in our *Vulgar*.

In the 3d Chapter, verse 10. of the same Epistle to *Titus*, *St. Jerom* hath read, *Hereticum hominem post unam correptionem evita*, *Avoid a man that is an Heretick after one admonition*, as it appears from his Commentary on this place: It is also expressed after the same manner in the Version of *Hilary*; excepting that instead of the word *unam*, *one*, he reads *primam*, *the first*; but we find in the *Latin* of the two Manuscripts of *St. Germain* and *Clermont*, *Hereticum hominem post unam correptionem evita & duo*, *Avoid a man that is an Heretic after one or two admonitions*; and in the *Greek* after the same manner; *κατὰ μίαν ἢ δύο ἐλέησεις καὶ οὐ πορεύῃς*. It is also Printed in our *Vulgar*, *post unam & secundam correptionem*, *after the first and second admonition*, conformably to the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, who Translated this passage thus, *Post unam & alteram correptionem*, as *St. Jerom* hath observed, (e) who declares moreover, that this reading was approved by *St. Athanasius*, because (saith he) it is not sufficient but once to reprove or admonish those that are overtaken with a fault. All the *Greek* Copies that we have at present, agree with this last reading, which is retained in our *Vulgar*, neither hath *Pelagius* read it otherwise in his Edition and in his Commentary.

(e) Legitur in Latinis codicibus, quod verum Papa quoque Athanasius approbabat, post unam & alteram correptionem, quod scilicet non sufficiat tantum semel eum corripi vel commoneri, qui aliquo sit depravatus errore. Hier. Comm. in c. 3. Epist. ad Tit.

St. Jerom hath Remarked on the last words of this Epistle, where we find in our Vulgar, *gratia Dei*, the grace of God, that it was read in the Latin Copies in his time, *gratia Domini nostri*, the grace of our Lord; but that it ought to be read simply, *gratia*, grace, as it was in the Original Greek: Indeed all the Greek Copies that are extant at this day, agree with him in this particular; but the two ancient Copies of Clermont and St. Germain have *weis* in the Greek, and *Domini* in the Latin.

In the Epistle to Philemon, verse 1st. Instead of *Vinctus Christi Jesu*, the Prisoner of Jesus Christ; We find in the Latin Manuscripts of St. Germain and Clermont, *Apostolus Jesu Christi*, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, and in the Greek ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. We read also in the same place in these two Copies after ἀγαπητῷ, beloved, the word ἀδελφῷ, Brother, and *fratri* in the Version of Hilary, which is not in that of St. Jerom.

In the 2d verse of this Epistle it is written in the Latin of both the Manuscripts of St. Germain and Clermont, *Sorori*, Sister, and in the Greek ἀδελφῷ; but the word *Charissima*, most dear, is not found therein, which is Conformable to the Translation of St. Jerom. Hilary hath both words, *Sorori Charissima*, in his Edition, as it is in the present Vulgar. Pelagius reads only *Charissima*, and intimates in his Commentary that she was either his Sister or his Wife, without determining any thing. *Apphia vero* (saith he) *soror vel conjux creditur*.

Pelag.
Comm.
in Epist.
ad Philem.

The word *operis*, work, which is in our Vulgar, verse 6th, is not read in the Latin of the Manuscript of St. Germain: Neither is it found in the greater part of the Greek Manuscripts, nor in the best and most Authentic Latin Copies; therefore Zegerus was of Opinion that it ought to be taken out of the Vulgar, as being but very lately inserted therein; moreover he is unwilling that such weak proofs as this, should be opposed against the Heretics that deny the necessity of good Works, *Absit*, (saith this Critic) *ut quisquam velit assutitiis hujusmodi verbis convincere hæreticos*. But Lucas Brugensis declares that he hath read it in two ancient Latin Copies; from whence he proves that this is no new reading, as Zegerus believed: It is apparent that the Censors of Rome have for this thought fit to preserve it in our Vulgar. *Cor-*

Zeg. Ca-
ritig. in
N. T. ad
Epist. ad
Philem.

Luc. Brug.
Corr.
Rom. ad
Philem.
v. 6.

rectores (saith this learned Critic) *judicarunt non esse omittendum operis*. In the 7th verse where we find in the most part of the present Greek Copies, χάρις, grace, it is read in the two Manuscripts of St. Germain and Clermont, χαῖρα, as also in the Vulgar, *gaudium*, joy: St. Jerom, Hilary, and Pelagius confirm this Reading.

Lastly, in the 19th verse of this Epistle to Philemon, these words, ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ, in the Lord, are written after προσοφείλεις, thou owest, and in the Latin, *in domino*, which are not found in our Vulgar, nor in any other Copy; insomuch that they seem to have been added in these two ancient Manuscripts.

C H A P. VI.

Reflections on the various Readings of the ancient Latin Copies produced in the two preceeding Chapters. A comparison between the two Latin Editions called Vulgar, the first whereof was only used in the Western Churches until the seventh Century.

IT appears from what hath been above related, that the ancient Latin Edition of the New Testament called the *Italic*, is different in many places from that which is used at present : This last that owes its Original to the Corrections of St. *Jerom*, is often more accurate than the former, because it is more conformable to the best and most authentick *Greek* Copies : Nevertheless it doth as it were keep the middle way between the ancient Version, and another that perhaps would have been more exact, if the judgment of this Father had been entirely followed. It might indeed be easily brought to perfection, even at this day, by the help of good Manuscripts, according to the true rules of the Art of Critic. But as St. *Jerom* declares that in Revising the Ancient *Latin* Translation, by comparing it with Correct *Greek* Copies, he hath left some small faults, lest he should seem to introduce too great alterations into a Version that was authorised by a constant use for so long a time : In like manner the Censors of *Rome* have thought fit to pass by some places that might have been altered, *In hac* (say these prudent Critics) *pervulgata lectione, sicut nonnulla consulto mutata : Ita etiam alia quæ mutanda videbantur, consulto immutata relicta sunt.* They pretended not to publish an Edition of the Bible absolutely exempt from the smallest defects, but only to exhibit it more Correct than it was formerly, *Accipe* (subjoyn these Censors in the same place) *veterem ac vulgatam Sacra Scriptura Editionem quanta fieri potuit diligentia castigatam : quam quidem sicut omnibus numeris absolutam pro humana imbecillitate affirmare difficile est ; ita ceteris omnibus quæ ad hanc usque diem prodierunt, emendatiorem purioremque esse minime dubitandum.*

This being granted as undoubted matter of Fact, none can reasonably take it amiss that some passages are above Exhibited, wherein our *Vulgar* might have been Corrected ; not that 'tis believed that they ought to be reformed according to these observations ; we are persuaded on the contrary, that no private person hath a right to alter any thing : However this doth not hinder but that Critics may be permitted to Reflect on those places that they judg not to be absolutely exact : It is sufficient to obey the Laws of the Church by introducing

no Innovations into the Text. These kinds of Remarks have been allowed in all times ; and it might be easily proved by many Examples that the most learned Ecclesiastical Writers have often taken the liberty to make such on the Holy Scriptures. The Censors of Rome do freely acknowledg that they have reaped profit from the Labours of some eminent Men that have formerly applied themselves to the Correction of the Bible. Indeed the diligence of certain worthy Persons that have taken pains before them in Correcting the *Latin Bible*, cannot be enough commended, especially of some Doctors of *Louvain*, who consulted many Manuscript Copies, that they might be better able to judg of the true readings that ought to be retained in the *Vulgar*. It is apparent that these Divines are mentioned in the Preface to the Bible of *Clement VIII.* wherein it is expressed that they have deserved great commendation in being so industrious and careful in re-establishing the ancient *Latin Edition* in its Primitive Purity, *Insignium Academicarum Theologi in Editione Vulgata pristino suo nitori restituenda magna cum laude laboraverunt.* But since it was very difficult to procure a sufficient number of Manuscripts requisit to perform an undertaking of this nature, the Pope spared no cost in this affair, in causing them to be searched out in all the parts of Christendom, *Codices MSS. complures & vetustiores Summi Pontificis jussu conquesti.*

Præf.
Bibl.
Clem.
VIII.

Ibid.

Forasmuch as they that were employed in this Work were no Prophets, some things must of necessity escape their Critical Enquiries ; therefore it is always Lawful to re-examine their Corrections according to the Touch-stone of good Authentic Copies, by observing the same Rules that they have followed ; nevertheless without altering in any particular whatsoever the Edition published by the Authority of the Popes. The most learned Commentators on the New Testament make no scruple to remark the places that might be amended in our *Vulgar* ; and the various readings produced in the two preceding Chapters being grounded on the most ancient Ecclesiastical Writers are chiefly directed to this end. Amongst all these ancient Writers none represents to us the *Italic Version* that was used in the Western Churches more accurately than *Hilary the Deacon*, who lived under the Pontificate of Pope *Damasus*, and was Contemporary with *St. Jerom* ; for besides that this Deacon declares in his Commentaries on the Epistles of *St. Paul*, that he constantly exercised himself in the Study of the Holy Scriptures ; he protests moreover that he hath exactly followed the *Latin Copies*, which he prefers before the *Greek* ; nay, and sometimes Corrects the later by the former. This appears from the following passage of the Epistle to the *Romans*, *Regnavit mors ab Adam usque ad Moysen, etiam in eos qui non peccaverunt, Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned.* He insists in his Commentary, that it ought to be read without the negative Particle,

Epist. to
the Rom.
c. 5. v. 14.

Particle, *In eos qui peccaverunt*, over them that had sinned; and confirms this reading by the Authority of *Tertullian*, *Victorinus*, and *St. Cyprian*; he concludes thereupon that the *Greek* Copies from which the ancient *Latin* Version was taken, had not the said negative Particle, that was read in his time, and is also found therein at this day, *Constat autem* (saith he) *quosdam Latinos porro olim de veteribus Græcis translatos codicibus, quos incorruptos simplicitas temporum servavit & probat, &c.* Ambros. Comm. in c. 5. Epist. ad Rom. Furthermore he urged that these ancient *Latin* Copies should in that place be a rule to the *Greek*, which he believed to be corrupted on purpose by those that suited them to their own Opinions: But the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* who judged that this alteration was of great consequence, because it seemed to favour the false notions of *Pelagius*, have omitted nothing that may serve to diminish the reputation of this Writer, Since the authority of this Man (say they) is not very considerable in it self, his Book being filled with a great number of Errors, to know whether he determined rightly in this particular, we need only observe that he wrote to *Pope Damasus*, that is to say, at the same time when *St. Jerom* took pains in revising the *New Testament* by the Order of this *Pope*; and that he declares that the *Latin* Copies being full of Faults, ought to be Corrected from the *Greek*. They add further, that this Author being Infected with the *Pelagian* Heresy, might well prefer the Copies that had not the negative particle, as being most conformable to his Erroneous Tenets. Remarq. sur la Requ. de Mr. d' Ambr.

However, the Works of *Hilary* the Deacon, whose Authority is disesteemed because (as it is affirmed by them) they are filled with *Pelagian* Errors, have been read until these later times under the name of *St. Ambrose*. *Zegerus* whom *Mr. Arnauld* reckons in the number of able Critics, vigorously defends this reading that is accused of *Pelagianism*, *Nisi longus* (saith he) *hic mihi refragaretur usus atque consensus Ecclesie, mallet cum Ambrosio legi, in eos qui peccaverunt; & scito perperam a scribis additum esse ibi non.* Zeg. Castig. in N. T. ad c. 5. Epist. ad Rom. Were it not that the continual custom and consent of the Church opposeth me in this point, I had rather that it should be read with *Ambrose*, over them that had sinned; since the word *not*, hath been Erroneously added by the Transcribers. *Morinus* hath also objected the Testimony of this Deacon under the name of *St. Ambrose* against the Protestants, (a) who reject the *Vulgar* to adhere altogether to the *Greek* or *Hebrew* Copies; but since all the reasons alledged by him are weak and frivolous, they deserve no regard; for when a dispute ariseth concerning the true reading of a Book, it is requisite to consult the ancient Copies thereof, without declaring for any Party. If *Hilary* be charged with *Pelagianism* on

Eorum effrenam audaciam cohibet quam Latinos codices nulla distinctione aut circumspectione habita ex Græcis aut Hebræis emendare satagunt. Mor. Exerc. Bibl. lib. 1. Exerc. 2. c. 1.

this account only, because his sentiments are not always conformable to these of *St. Augustin*, it would follow that all ancient Traditions ought to be Reform'd according to the Doctrin of this Father, which would be a great absurdity in Divinity. The Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* cannot set in opposition to this Deacon the Authority of *St. Jerom*, who hath Revised and altered the ancient Version of the New Testament by the help of *Greek* Copies; for besides, that they do not believe that this Father was Infallible in his Correction, *Hilary* hath produced arguments that prove, at least in all probability, that it was necessary to Correct the *Greek* according to the *Latin* in that place: Moreover, when *St. Jerom* intimated that the Copies of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter were full of Faults, he did not mention those Faults to which the name of Errors or Heresies is attributed.

To judg then according to the rules of the Art of Critic, touching the Observation of this Author on Chap. 5. v. 14. of the Epistle to the *Romans*; I affirm that he was mistaken in Correcting this passage of the *Greek* from the *Latin*, seeing there was a variety in the *Latin* Copies, whereas he could find none in the *Greek*; he doth not seem to have acted sincerely in this point, in regard that he generally opposed the *Latin* against the *Greek*, as if there had been no diversity therein in his time; nevertheless it is certain that the *Latin* Copies did not agree amongst themselves, for some had the Negative Particle, and in others it was not inserted. *St. Augustin* who approved the contrary reading, plainly confesses that the Negative Particle was not read in his time in the greatest part of the *Latin* Copies, *Scio* (saith this learned Bishop) *plerosque Latinos codices sic habere: Regnavit mors ab Adam usque ad Moysen in eos qui peccaverunt in similitudinem prævaricationis Adæ.* But he subjoyns afterwards, (b) *That all the Greek Copies, or at least almost all from which the Latin Version was composed, contain the Negative Particle.* This Critical Remark of *St. Augustin* seems to me to be more judicious than that of *Hilary* the Deacon; and indeed the *Latin* of the ancient Manuscript of *St. Germain des Pres*, is consonant to the present Vulgar; neither is there any difference thereupon amongst the *Greek* Copies: I shall therefore oppose to this Writer a Copy that contains the *Italick* Version as well as his Edition, and with which he almost constantly agrees when he departs from our Vulgar.

Thus we ought to judg concerning the true reading of this place, and not according to the various conceits of Divines who usually maintain that which is most favourable to their Opinions: *Zegerus* was

(b) *Græci autem codices, unde in Latinam linguam interpretatio facta est, aut omnes, aut pene omnes, id quod a me primo posui habent.* Aug. de pecc. mer. & rem. lib. I. c. 11.

too rash in undertaking to Reform our Vulgar in this particular; as if the particle *Non* had been preposterously added by the Transcribers in the *Latin* Text: Neither is there any weight in the accusation that *Morinus* hath Exhibited against the Protestants on occasion of this passage of *St. Paul*, who pretends to prove by the Authority of *St. Ambrose*, that is, *Hilary* the Deacon, that they have recourse without any precaution to the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Originals; but this Objection is of no force, and not at all to the purpose, since they have good reason with *St. Jerom* and *St. Augustin* in this case, to prefer the *Greek* before some *Latin* Copies.

The Sectaries of these Primitive times differed altogether in their judgment from the present; they had a very great respect for the ancient *Latin* Edition: And being very far from reforming it according to the *Greek*, as the Protestants often do without any necessity; they believed that when the *Latin* did not agree with the *Greek*, there was a fault in the later. *St. Jerom* reproves *Helvidius* (c) for asserting, without reason, that the *Greek* Copies were corrupted in those places wherein they were not conformable to the *Latin*: This Father argues that Application ought rather to be made to the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Originals than to the Translations, because the Water is more pure in the Spring than in the Channel: But this Heretic derided the Critical Remarks of *St. Jerom*, as Disputes that seemed to him to contain more curiosity than truth in them, *Hac ais* (saith this Father introducing *Helvidius* speaking thus) *apud me nugæ sunt & argumentationes* Hier. *ibid.* *superflue, & disputatio magis curiosa quam vera.* He objects to him again in this Book that the Originals ought to be esteemed above the Versions; and smartly represents to him that it is a piece of folly to embrace the contrary Opinion, *Ac ne forte* (adds he) *de exemplariorum veritate causeris, quia tibi stultissime persuasisti Græcos codices esse falsos, &c.* Indeed this is the method that he made use of in revising the ancient *Latin* Version; not but that he sometimes Cites this Edition in those places where he believed it to be altered; and this matter is well worth our Observation, whereof we have a considerable example in this same Book against *Helvidius* in which he relates a passage of the first Epistle of *St. Paul* to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 7. v. 33, 34. according to the *Italick*, but when he produceth the very same expression against *Jovinian*, he Translates it after another manner, and

(c) *Licet tu mira impudentia hæc in Græcis codicibus falsata contendas, quæ non solum omnes Græciæ tractatores in suis voluminibus reliquerunt, sed nonnulli quoque e Latinis ita ut in Græcis habentur assumpserunt. Nec necesse est nunc de exemplariorum varietate tractare, cum omne & veteris & novæ Scripturæ Instrumentum in Latinum sermonem exinde translatum sit, & multo purior manere credenda sit fontis unda quam rivi.* Hier. adv. Helvid.

as he read it in his *Greek Copy*; he likewise alledgeth the reasons of his alteration, (d) *It is convenient (saith he) that I inform you that it is read in the Latin Copies, Divisa est Virgo & Mulier, there is a difference between a Wife and a Virgin, which words have their proper sense, and I have elsewhere explained them according to this expression, because the place required it; but this explication is not agreeable to the Greek Original, the Apostle having Written as we have above Translated it:*

ver. 33. Sollicitus est quæ sunt mundi, quomodo placeat uxori & divisus est, careth for the things that are of the World, how he may please his Wife, and so is divided.

This last reading hath been followed in our *Vulgar*, and is established by *St. Jerom* and some other *Latin Fathers*; the other, which the same *St. Jerom* approved in his Writings against *Helvidius*, and rejected in his first Book against *Jovinian* as not being Written by the Apostle, is that of the ancient *Latin Interpreter*: Therefore it is also in the *Italick* of the Manuscript of *St. Germain*: *Divisa est mulier & virgo quæ innupta est, There is a difference between a Wife, and a Virgin that is unmarried*, and this reading is confirmed by *Tertullian*. But what is most worthy to be observed is, that the greatest part of the *Greek Manuscripts* agree in this with the ancient *Latin Interpreter*; insomuch that it is a hard matter to grant to *St. Jerom* that the reading which he hath chosen is the true, and as he calls it, the *Apostolic*, since the other is more ancient and is founded on a greater number of Copies, and even on the ancient *Greek Commentators*. *Hilary* represents here the two readings that were apparently joyned together in his Edition; from whence it may be inferred, that the *Latin Copies* varied thereupon in the time of this Deacon.

All this proves that it cannot be determined, which is the true reading of the Apostle in this place, there being so strong arguments both for the one and the other; therefore I would not venture, as *Zegerus* hath done, to reform the present *Greek Copies* according to the reading that *St. Jerom* names *Apostolic*, altho *Robert Stephen* hath inserted it in two of his *Greek Copies*, and *Simon de Colines* hath followed him in his *Greek Edition* of the New Testament; neither is it always safe to condemn the old Edition called the *Italic* upon the Critical Observations of this Father; for he is sometimes biaßed by his own Opinions, having regard to them in the several Subjects of which he Treats: He avouches for example,

(d) Nunc illud breviter admonéo, in Latinis codicibus hunc locum ita legi, divisa est virgo & mulier. Quod quanquam habeat suum sensum, & a me quoque pro qualitate loci sic edisserturn sit, tamen non est Apostolicæ veritatis, siquidem Apostolus ita scripsit ut supra transtulimus. Hier. lib. 1. adv. Jovin.

when he Disputes against *Jovinian*, that it ought not to be read in the first Epistle of St. Paul to *Timothy*, Chap. 2. v. 9. *Sobrietas*, *Sobriety*, as it was in the *Latin* Copies of his time; but *Castitas*, *Chastity*, because it is expressed in the *Greek*, σωροσύνη, *Non enim* (saith he) *ut male habetur in Latinis codicibus, sobrietas est legenda, sed castitas*, Hier. lib. id est, σωροσύνη. Nevertheless it was not thought fit to admit this alteration of St. *Jerom* in our *Vulgar*, for it is read therein at this day, *Cum verecundia & sobrietate*, with *shamefacedness and sobriety*. Neither is it found otherwise in the two ancient Manuscripts of *Clermont* and St. *Germain*; whereupon *Erasmus* hath very well observed (e) that since the *Greek* word σωροσύνη, might be interpreted after these two different ways, St. *Jerom* hath restrained it in this place to the sense that he imagined to be most favourable to his Cause, notwithstanding that it was well Translated in the Ancient *Latin* Copies by *Sobrietas*. However, the said Father is not the first Author of this Reformation; for St. *Cyprian* and *Hilary* the Deacon have read *cum verecundia & pudicitia*.

We shall examin on the same account several other passages that St. *Jerom* hath thought necessary to be Corrected in the ancient *Vulgar*: He affirms for example, without departing from his Books against *Jovinian*, that in Chap. 3. v. 2. of the first Epistle of St. Paul to *Timothy*, where it is in the *Greek* νηφάλιον, and in the *Italic*, *Sobrium*, *Sober*; this *Greek* word might be better Translated by *vigilantem*, *vigilant*. *Sobrium* (saith he) *sive ut melius in Græco dicitur, vigilantem, id est, νηφάλιον*. He adds in the same place, that the *Greek* word σώφρονα, which the ancient *Latin* Interpreter hath rendred *Prudent*, signifies *Chast*. *Pudicum, hoc enim significat σώφρονα, ornatum & castitate & moribus*. *Marianus Victorius* in his *Scholia's* confirms these two Corrections of St. *Jerom*; nevertheless we have not forbore to preserve the ancient reading in our *Vulgar*. *Erasmus* on the contrary, after he hath approved these two Interpretations, avers that the *Greek* word σώφρονα in this place might be Translated by *Sobrium*; but that St. *Jerom* chose the Sense that was most agreeable to his own inclinations, as it usually happens in Controversies. *Agit suum negotium Hieronymus, ut par est in pugna; alioqui nihil vetat quominus σώφρονα sobrium Interpretemur*. Our *Vulgar* exhibits both the readings; for besides the word *prudentem*, *pudicum* is also added therein; which ought to be ascribed to the two different versions of the *Greek* word σώφρονα. But the ancient Manuscript of *Clermont* hath not *pudicum*.

(e) Vox hæc σωροσύνη Græcis significat aliquando sobrietatem sive temperantiam; aliquando modestiam, aut verecundiam; aliquando pudicitiam, quod ista ferme cohereant, quanquam bene habeat sobrietas. Sed Hieronymus capiat commodum argumentationis suæ, & torquet hanc dictionem ad patrocinium parvis suæ, *Erasm. Schol. in lib. 1. Hier. adv. Jovin.*

But after all, we are much obliged to St. *Jerom* for Correcting the *Italic* in an infinite number of places wherein it was defective ; he generally follows the best *Greek* Copies, without insisting on those that had the same alterations as the ancient *Vulgar*, and hath recourse to those that were read in the Eastern Churches ; for this reason he most commonly agrees with the ancient *Greek* Commentators on the New Testament : These defects that this learned Critic hath supplied in the *Latin* Edition of his time, are for the most part very ancient, and derive their Original almost from the first beginning of Christianity ; which causeth me to suspect that the ancient Version of the Western Churches was composed from Copies that had been thus mutilated in many places ; and that St. *Jerom* durst not absolutely cast this Translation that was conformable thereto, into a new Mold. However, it is sufficient to make this Remark in general, that when we shall have occasion to read the Works of some of the most ancient Fathers, we may not be surpris'd to see them so far distant from the Copies of the New Testament, either *Greek* or *Latin* that we have at present. I could produce several Examples of these Variations, but I shall be content only to observe here, that St. *Irenaus*, *Tertullian*, St. *Cyprian*, and some other ancient Ecclesiastical Writers have not read in the 15th Chapter of the *Acts* of the Apostles, verse 29. a suffocatis, from things Strangled. St. *Cyprian* who hath Rehears'd this whole passage at length expresseth it after this manner, *Visum est Spiritui Sancto & nobis nullam vobis imponere sarcinam, quam ista quæ ex necessitate sunt, abstinere vos ab idololatriis, & sanguinis effusione, & fornicatione* : It seem'd good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no burden, but these things that are necessary, to abstain from Idolatries, and from the Effusion of Blood, and from Fornication. The Bishop of Oxford declares, (f) That the greatest part of the Ancient Fathers have made no mention of things strangled, because they believed that they were comprehended in the prohibition of Blood. But the true reason of this Omission is, that these words were not in their Copies ; neither are they read by St. *Irenaus* who wrote in the *Greek* Tongue ; and this is the cause that they are not found either in the *Greek* nor in the *Latin* of the ancient Manuscript of *Cambridg*.

Moreover *Hilary* the Deacon opposeth his *Latin* Edition in which they were not contained against the *Greek* of his time wherein they were ; he pretends also to prove from thence, that the *Grecians* had corrupted their Books by adding to them that which was not inserted therein from the beginning, *Tria* (saith he) *hæc mandata ab Apostolis*

(f) *Plerique ex veteribus qui in ea erant sententia, sanguinis mentione ejus usum fuisse interdictum, suffocari mentionem, velut supervacaneam præteriere.* Joann. Oxon. Not. in lib. 3. Testim. Cyp.

& senioribus data reperiuntur, id est, ut observent se ab idololatria & sanguine, sicut Noe, & fornicatione. Quae sophista Graecorum non intelligentes, scientes tamen a sanguine non abstinendum, adulterarunt Scripturam, quantum mandatum addentes, & a suffocato observandum. But the Authority of St. Jerom hath been preferred in our Vulgar before that of the Ancient Copies, and of the Writers of the Primitive Times. This Learned Critic agrees in this Particular with all the Greek Copies that are now extant, except that of Cambridge, the Greek whereof is conformable almost in every Point to the *Italic* Version.

There is on the contrary an Addition in this ancient *Latin* Translation, that is not in our Vulgar: But it is written in the Greek, and in the *Latin* of the Manuscript of Cambridge: And that which demonstrates it to be very Ancient is, That St. Irenaeus and St. Cyprian have also read it in their Copies. It is expressed after this manner in the Manuscript of Cambridge, in the 20th Verse of the same 15th Chapter of the *Acts*, *ὅτι οὐ μὴ διέλθῃ αὐτοῖς πλῆθος ἐτέροις μὴ ποιεῖν*. Robert Stephen hath produced two other Manuscripts, wherein he found the same Addition. St. Irenaeus hath thus recited it with the preceeding Words: *Præcipiendum est eis ut abstineant a vanitatibus idolorum, & a fornicatione, & a sanguine, & quaecunque nolunt sibi fieri, aliis ne faciant*. They are to be enjoined to abstain from the Vanities of Idols, and from Fornication, and from Blood; and whatsoever things they would not have done to themselves, that they should not do the same to others. He Repeats the same Passage a little after, conformably to that which is read in the 29th Verse of this Chapter. *Placuit enim Sancto Spiritui & nobis nullum amplius vobis pondus imponere quam haec quae sunt necessaria, ut abstineatis ab idolothytis, & sanguine, & fornicatione*. For it hath pleased the Holy Ghost and us, to lay no greater Weight upon you than these things that are necessary, That ye abstain from things offered to Idols, and from Blood, and from Fornication. And subjoyns afterwards, as it is above-mentioned, *& quaecunque non vultis fieri vobis, aliis ne faciatis*. And whatsoever things ye would not have done to your selves, do not the same to others. These last Words are not in our Vulgar, though they are inserted in the Ancient *Latin* Edition.

St. Cyprian hath also read in the Place that we have now cited, *& quaecunque vobis fieri non vultis, aliis ne feceritis*; Infomuch that it cannot be doubted that this Expression was in the Copies of the *Italic* Version, before it was revised by St. Jerom. This hath obliged Zegerus to determine (g) that it would be requisite to re-establish them in the *Latin* Edition, from which they were taken away; because it doth not appear that they were added therein, by way of Explication; besides,

(g) Consultius videtur, ut haec deinceps ascribantur; nec enim videntur adjecta explicandi gratia, ut alia pleraque. At haec Irenaeus & Cyprianus scriptores sunt vetustissimi, quorum etate minus erat in libris adjectivularum, quam tempore sequenti. Zeger. Castig. in N. T. c. 15. Act.

that there was (according to his Judgment) a much lesser Number of Additions in the Copies, when St. *Irenaus* and St. *Cyprian* lived, than in the succeeding Times : But this Critic is deceived, not having well examined the most ancient Manuscripts of the New Testament, that are full of these kinds of Additions, and of innumerable other Alterations, which St. *Jerom* hath judiciously corrected in our Edition, that was revised by him according to certain *Greek* Copies, which were more exact than these first, and generally conformable to those that we now have at present. To be convinced of this Truth, we need only to cast our Eyes on the variations of the Copy of *Cambridge*, that are collected in the *Greek* New Testament, printed at *Oxford*: This ancient Manuscript is so different from the other *Greek* Copies, and from our Vulgar, especially in the *Acts of the Apostles*, that one would think that it were another Book : Wherefore it is so far from being convenient to alter our Vulgar according to St. *Irenaus*, *Tertullian*, St. *Cyprian* and some other Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, that it is much more Safe, to reform their Readings, by the Copies whether *Greek* or *Latin* that we now read at this Day : This indeed is somewhat strange, but it is a matter of Fact that is very obvious : And although we cannot alledge the true Reasons of this great Alteration that hath happened in the Books of the New Testament, ever since the Primitive Ages of Christianity ; nevertheless it ceaseth not to be evident. The *Greek* and the *Latin* Churches have had their Critics, who have taken Pains to rectifie these Books with all possible Care and Exactness : This Reformation hath been pursued by the other Eastern Churches ; the *Syrian* that hath the most ancient Copies of the New Testament, after the *Greek* and *Latin*, doth not agree thereupon with the Manuscript of *Cambridge*.

It is true, That all these Churches have some Differences in their Books ; but they are not of the same Nature as those that are found in the Copy of *Cambridge*, as also in some others ; and in the Ancient Vulgar, that is conformable to these Manuscripts, it is apparent that they have been corrected in an Infinite Number of Places, in which the Order of the Words is changed, to render the Stile more polite, and less intricate, and some Illustrations are also annexed : As for example, in the 4th Chapter of the *Acts*, Verse 32. after these Words, *ἡ ψυχὴ μία*, one Soul, it is added in the Manuscript of *Cambridge*, *καὶ οὐκ ἦν διακρίσις ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑσθία*, and there was no Difference between them. St. *Cyprian* hath also read in his *Latin* Edition, to the same effect, *nec fuit inter illos discrimen ullum*. There are divers other such Additions in these kinds of Manuscripts that are found in St. *Cyprian*, as in Verse 10 of the same Chap. 4. of the *Acts*, they are not content only to insert, *ἐν τῷ*, by him, but it is written moreover in a Manuscript cited in the Manuscript of *Oxford*, *καὶ ἐν ἄλλω ὅτι*, and by no other. St. *Cyprian* hath likewise read it in this same Sense, *in alio autem nullo*.

Let us apply that which we have now observed in the *Acts* of the *Apostles* to the other Places of the New Testament, wherein the Ancient *Latin* Edition differs from the present; it was read, for example, heretofore in the *Italic*, and even in our *Latin* Copies before the last Reformation, in the 1st Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 10. V. 17. *omnes enim de uno pane & de uno calice participamus.* For we are all Partakers of that one Bread, and of that one Cup; whereas these Words are no longer in our Vulgar, being corrected from the *Greek* Copies that agree all in this, except those of the *Marquess de Veles*, who hath read in one of his Manuscripts *ἐκ τῆς ἑνὸς ποτηρίου.* Hilary the Deacon hath also in his Version, according to this *Greek* Reading, *& de uno Calice*, which causeth me to conjecture, that the Copy of this *Marquess* ought to be placed in the Rank of these Ancient Manuscripts, to which the *Italick* is conformable: This very same Reading is confirmed by the Copy of *St. Germain des Pres*, wherein it is written in the *Greek* *ἐκ τῆς ἑνὸς ποτηρίου*, and in the *Latin*, *& de uno calice.* Zegerus, who confesses, that the Ancient Interpreters have not read these Words, insists nevertheless, that they ought to be retained in our Vulgar, because the Musical Office in the Churches hath authorized them, and in regard that they are in the *Latin* Vulgar Editions. *Cum id habeat* (saith this Author) *& canat usus Ecclesia, & huic suffragentur codices vulgares, atq; adeo contextus Ambrósianus, ex quo in nostra Editione repositum puto a Castigatore Ecclesiastico.* But the Censors of *Rome* that have taken them away from the Vulgar Editions are more Judicious; therefore *Lucas Brugensis* hath remarked in the *Index*, that he published of their Corrections, that they should not be added in the Text: *Non addas & de uno Calice.* Neither have the Divines of *Louvain* inserted them in the *Latin* Text, which they caused to be printed before the Reformation of *Rome*, but only in the Margin with an Asterisk.

Zeg. Ca-
stig. in
N. T.
Epist. ad
Cor. cap.
10.

The Reflections above exhibited on the Variations of the two Vulgar Editions of the Western Churches, plainly shew, that that which is used at present is more accurate than the Ancient, because it is found to be conformable to the best *Greek* Manuscripts that *St. Jerom* consulted, when he revised the *Italick*. It appears, moreover, from these Observations, that the oldest *Greek* Manuscripts are often less exact than those that were extant in the Eastern Countries since *Origen* and *Eusebius*; and lastly, that it is not safe always to follow the Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, under Pretence of their Antiquity, since we have clear Proofs that there was in their Time a great deal of Confusion in the Books of the New Testament, especially amongst the *Latin* Copies. None ought to wonder that in treating of the *Italic* Version I have made little or no mention of *St. Augustin*, who nevertheless professes that he hath followed it: I have observed in reading the Works of this Father, That he more generally adhered to this Ancient Edition in the Books of the Old Testament than in those of the New, in which he sometimes

sometimes makes use of the Corrections of St. Jerom, whom he commends in one of his Letters, for translating the Gospels out of Greek into Latin. *Non parvas, (saith he) Deo gratias agimus de opere tuo, quod Evangelium ex Græco interpretatus es, quia pene in omnibus nulla offensio est, cum Scripturam Græcam contulerimus.* However St. Jerom only revised the Ancient Latin Translation, as he declares in his Epistle to Pope Damasus, leaving many Things therein that he might have Corrected.

Aug. lib.
2 Retr.
cap. 32.

St. Augustin nevertheless continued always to cleave to the *Italic*, excepting that the Editions thereof being very different, he was obliged to consult the *Greek*, and the Corrections of St. Jerom, to find a Remedy. Forasmuch as he was perswaded that the Water is more pure in the Spring than in the Channels, he sometimes returns to this Original Fountain, and regulates the *Latin* by the *Greek*, without abandoning the *Italic*. Moreover he seems to acknowledge that some Books of the New Testament were not very well translated, as he insinuates, in speaking of his Observation on the Epistle of St. James. *I had not, (saith this Learned Bishop) an exact Latin Translation, when I dictated my Annotations on this Epistle. Ipsam Epistolam quam legebamur, quando ista dictavi, non diligenter ex Græco habebamus interpretatam.* But that which causeth some Difficulty, is his Work, entituled, *Speculum*, that contains a Collection of a great number of Passages as well of the Old as of the New Testament. He useth, throughout this whole Volume, the Version of St. Jerom; which seems to prove, That he was not the Author thereof, at least that he did not compose it after the same manner as we now find it. But since Possidius hath inserted a Book under the same Title in his Catalogue, it is probable that that which remains in our Hands at present, was corrected and altered by some later Writer; from the New Translation of St. Jerom.

Pelagius, whose Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul we have amongst the Works of St. Jerom, doth likewise most commonly agree with the Ancient *Latin* Edition; and it would appear that he was more addicted to the use thereof, if his Writings had not been altered in many Places; therefore it is requisite to keep this in mind, in reading the *Latin* Fathers that lived before the Version of St. Jerom was received; for the Publishers that caused them to be printed, have often adapted their Citations to our Vulgar: They have not spared *Hilary* the Deacon, who varies from the old *Latin* Edition less than any other Father. On this account it sometime happens, that the Commentaries of these Authors do not agree with the Text cited by them. *Pelagius* nevertheless seems to have followed in some Places the Corrections of St. Jerom. As for *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian*, though they do not precisely relate the Words of the *Italic*, because they consulted the *Greek*, yet they retain the Sense, whereupon their Works may always serve to discover the Differences of the two Vulgars, when these diversities do not consist in single Words.

C H A P. VII.

Of the present Vulgar Edition: Whether St. Jerom be the sole Author thereof: Certain Reasons that cause it to be doubted: An Answer to these Reasons, with Reflections on the Opinion of some Divines. The Judgment of Cardinal Peter d'Ailly, and of Martinus Dorpius, a Divine of Lovain, on the Reformation of the Vulgar.

EVERY particular Church (as we have above observed) hath had ever since its first Institution a Translation of the Holy Scriptures, for the Use of the Ignorant People, that could not read the Originals. We have seen that the *Latin Church* hath made use of one that was called by St. *Augustin* the *Italic*: But forasmuch as this *Italic* was full of Faults, especially in the New Testament, Pope *Damasus* ordered St. *Jerom* to revise it; which he did, at least with respect to the four Gospels; for he makes mention only of these Books in his Letter directed to the said Pope: *Hæc Præfens Præfatiuncula pollicetur tantum* Hier. præf. in 4 Evan. ad Dam. *quatuor Evangelia Codicum Græcorum emendata collatione, sed & veterum.* But when he exhibits a Catalogue of the Works, that he composed, he seems to intimate the whole New Testament: *Novum Testamentum Græca fidei reddidi.* Nevertheless it cannot be inferred from this Assertion, That he hath rectified the whole New Testament according to the Greek Copies, because it appears from one of his Letters to St. *Augustin*, that he hath given this Name to the Gospels. St. *Augustin* having thanked him for translating them out of Greek into Latin, *Evangelium ex Græco*; he styles that in his Answer to this Bishop, *Novum Testamentum*; which was simply called the Gospel; *Si me* (saith he) *mi dicis, in Novi Testamenti emendatione suscipis.* Hier. in fine Catal. de Script. Eccles.

We cannot therefore conclude from this single Expression of St. *Jerom*, that he hath corrected the whole ancient *Latin Version* of the New Testament, by the Greek Copies, since he distinctly mentions the four Gospels in his Epistle to *Damasus*; whereupon it is necessary to have Recourse to other Proofs. *Stunica*, who hath undertaken in a particular Discourse against *Jacobus Faber*, to shew that the Version now read in all the Western Churches, is that which St. *Jerom* revised, cites the Stun. Antap. adv. Jac. Fab. Preface of this Father to the *Acts of the Apostles*, and endeavours to prove from thence, That St. *Jerom* hath not only corrected the Ancient Interpretation of the Acts, and of the Epistles of St. *Paul*, but that he hath made a new Translation of these Books. Indeed nothing can be

be more formal than the Words of this Preface, (a) *You exhort me* (saith the pretended S. Jerom, speaking to two of his Friends) *to translate the Acts of the Apostles into Latin, as I have already translated the Epistles of St. Paul, and comprised them in one Volume.* But I shall make it appear in the sequel of this Treatise, That the most part of the Prefaces that are at the Head of every Book of the New Testament in many Manuscripts, and in a great Number of the first Editions of our Latin Bibles, were not made by St. Jerom.

The chief Objection produced by *Stunica*, against those that deny that this Father reviewed not only the *Latin Gospels*, but in like manner the rest of the New Testament, is, that he often instances in his Corrections of the Epistles of St. Paul, and in his Epistle to St. Marcellus, censures those that preferred the Ancient Latin Version, that was in the Hands of the People, before his new Edition. He quotes the Epistles of St. Paul in that Place; and it might be plainly demonstrated from his Commentaries, that we have on some of these Epistles, that he reformed the old Translation. Lastly, if we compare the remaining part of the *Italic* with the present Vulgar, we cannot doubt that they are two different Editions, or rather the same, being examined and corrected in some Places; and this Reformation can hardly be ascribed to any other but S. Jerom, who had already revised the Gospel by the Order of Pope *Damasus*.

Erasmus and divers other Writers of these later Times, who could not deny that St. Jerom reformed the old Edition of the New Testament, maintain (b) That we have not at present the Latin Copies after the same manner as this Father corrected them, but another Version. He pretends moreover, That he hath given us irrefragable Proofs of this his Asseveration. *Jacobus Faber* hath also treated at large on this Subject, in a Discourse that he composed on purpose under the Title of * *An Apology, shewing that the Vulgar Edition of the Epistles of St. Paul is not the Translation of St. Jerom.* He principally insists on this Argument, That this Father, when he cites the *Latin Interpreter*, mentions him as a different Interpreter from himself, and that he often accuses him of Ignorance: *Si sacer Hieronymus (saith he) hujus Editionis Interpretem, ut alium citat, Latinumque Interpretem, ut alium citat, Latinumque Interpretem appellat; & interpretationem ipsam nominat Vulgatam, nonne egregie conficitur, non esse Hieronymi translationem? Si Interpretem Latinum frequenter vellicat & inscitia accusat, &c.* But this Divine doth not seem to have understood the meaning of St. Jerom, when he quotes the Ancient

* *Apolo-
gia quod
vetus In-
terpreta-
tio Episto-
larum
Beatissi-
mi Pauli
quæ pas-
sim legitur
non sit
Tralati
Hierony-
mi.*

(a) *Post Apostoli Pauli Epistolas dudum uno vobis volumine translatas, Domnion & Rogatiane carissimi, Alius Apostolorum compellitis ut transferam in Latinum. Præf. sub. nom. Hier. in Acta. Apost.*

(b) *Hieronymus dicit se castigasse magis sensum quam verba, quanquam nec illam habemus castigationem. Erasmi. Schol. in Epist. Aug. ad. Hier.*

Edition under the Name of the *Latin* Interpreter, and even reproves him in many Places. This Passage is so far from making it apparent, that this Father is not the Author of the *Vulgar*, that we read at present, that it may be proved on the contrary from thence, that he hath corrected the Ancient Version of the Western Churches; and that this Translation, so Reformed, is the *Vulgar* that is used at this Day.

There is a little more probability in that which this Writer subjoins in the same place (c) *Admitting* (saith he) *that St. Jerom translated the New Testament, it cannot be inferred from thence, That our Vulgar is his Version, since it was not as yet received in the Publick Offices of our Churches.* He pretends to confirm this by a Catalogue of divers Passages in the Epistles of *St. Paul*, in which the *Vulgar* doth not agree with the Corrections of *St. Jerom*. Indeed this learned Father hath reformed divers Places of the Ancient *Latin* Interpretation in his Commentaries and in his other Works, after another manner than they are expressed at present in our Edition: Whence then (say they) could this Difference arise between *St. Jerom's* Alterations and our *Vulgar*, if it be true that he is the Author of the later? This caused *Zegerus* to believe, That our *Latin* Version of the New Testament could not be attributed entirely to *St. Jerom*; (d) but that some other Critic rectified the Ancient Edition about that Time, conformably to the Corrections of this Father, whom he followed but in part, having revised the rest according to the *Greek* Copies and other *Latin* Versions that were then very numerous. *Petrus Pithaus* seems not to be far from this Opinion, in his Disputation concerning the *Latin* Interpreters of the Bible. He there doubts, for the same Reasons, whether the *Latin* Translation of the Acts of the Apostles, and of the Epistles of *St. Paul* was certainly composed by *St. Jerom*.

P. Pith.
de Lat.
SS. Bibl.
Interpr.

But if there be any weight in these Arguments we ought also to conclude at the same time that the *Latin* Version of the Old Testament was not written by *St. Jerom*, because it often happens that it doth not agree with the Corrections inserted by him in his Commentaries and in some other Books; we need only to look into his Que-

(c) *Sed esto traduxerit. Numquid continuo fit, Ergo traductio Hieronymi ea est qua passim utuntur Ecclesie — si Epistolas Pauli traduxerit; si Apostolorum Catholicas; si Evangelia, si Actiones Apostolicas, nondum ea in lucem emerferunt publico usui Ecclesiarum recepta, neque etiam earum Scripturarum ejus ad integrum recognitiones.* Jac. Fab. Stap. in Apol.

(d) *Supereſt fateamur studiosum quempiam & probati hac in re judicii hominem circa Hieronymi tempora recognitionem fecisse librorum reliquorum, nempe eorum quorum recognitionem ab ipso editam videbat non recipi, & fortasse etiam totius Novi Instrumenti, idque in primis ex ipso Hieronymo, qui in hoc genus studio cœuris fuit frequentior; dinde, ut probabile est, ex collatione tum Græcorum, tum diversarum quæ tum ferebantur versionum.* Zeger. Prolog. Castig. in Nov. Test.

sions or Traditions on *Genesis*, and we shall there find examples of these different Translations, if we compare them with his Version. When St. *Jerom* Revised the ancient *Latin* Edition of the New Testament, he took care only to Purge it from those Faults that were most Notorious, and to alter some Expressions that were too Harsh; his Design (as he himself Professes, writing to Pope *Damasus*) was not to Restore it to an Absolute Perfection; for he further Declares, That he hath left some Faults on purpose, that he might not depart too far from the Text that was Established for so many Ages by the public use of the *Latin* Churches. This matter of Fact being evident, it is no wonder that he doth not always agree in his Commentaries and other Works with a Version that he acknowledges to be still Defective after he had Revised it. Moreover, it is known that St. *Jerom* doth sometimes suit his Translation to the Subject whereof he Treats, and according to the persons with whom he Disputes; besides that the words of the Original Greek having often divers significations, he was freely permitted to choose that which he thought convenient. *Ruffinus* reproached him heretofore on the account of this Inconstancy in some places of the Old Testament, which he had Translated in his Commentaries, otherwise than in his Version: He answers that he had committed no Fault in Interpreting an ambiguous word after two different ways. *Quid igitur peccavi, si verbum ambiguum diversa interpretatione converti?* He adds further, That he might do it in his Commentaries wherein a greater liberty was usually taken, *In commentariolis ubi libertas est differendi*. What Injury (saith he) is there offered to the Faith of the Church in acquainting the Reader with the different Expositions that are appropriated by the Jews to one passage of the H. Scripture? *Quid ergo Ecclesiastica fidei nocet, si doceatur lector quot modis apud Hebraeos unus versiculus explanetur?*

Hier. Apol.
adv. Ruff.
lib. 1.

Hier. ibid.

We have already observed that St. *Jerom* hath Translated the same words in the 7th Chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, after two different manners in his Books against *Helvidius* and *Jovinian*; in Disputing against the later, he Corrects the Version that he made use of in Encountering the former. *Erasmus*, who is one of those that deny that this Father is the Author of our *Latin* Edition of the New Testament, (e) takes notice of this diversity of Interpretation according to the different places: On this account he hath sometimes reprov'd the ancient *Latin* Interpreter

Chap. 6.

(e) Hunc locum aliter citat Hieronymus adversus Jovinianum, lib. 1. nempe ut nos vulgo legimus, sed ita ut fateatur se pro loci qualitate in alium sensum interpretatum fuisse. Erasmus, Schol. in lib. Hier. adv. Helv.

in his Disputes, as if he had not well Translated certain words, that are nevertheless retained in the present Vulgar, because indeed it was not necessary to alter them. We have seen Examples thereof in the preceeding Chapter : And this is much more conformable to the Principles of St. *Jerom* than the Supposition of *Stunica*, who affirms, That he retracted in imitation of some other Fathers, or that he wrote his other Works before his Translation, which is not conformable to them. Upon the whole matter, this Variation of St. *Jerom* is not a good Proof to demonstrate that he did not compose our *Latin* Version of the New Testament. It is much better proved on the contrary, that it could be made by none but him ; from the Places that he hath revised in the ancient Interpretation, and are found even at this Day in our Vulgar, corrected after the same manner as he declares that he reformed them : We cannot explain this Conformity of the Corrections of St. *Jerom* with the *Latin* Edition that was read for 900 Years in the Western Churches, but by acknowledging that he is the true Author thereof.

It would be only to conjecture to avouch with *Zegerus*, That some other Writer hath made use of the Corrections of this Father to give us a new Edition of the New Testament ; for besides that it cannot be discovered who this Writer was ; if this were granted, he would have exactly followed these Alterations : whereas St. *Jerom* in many Places, contradicts the readings of our Vulgar ; and there is no other Reason of this diversity but that which we have already alledged, *viz.* that he took the Liberty to correct in his Commentaries and other Works, a Translation that he durst not bring to an exact Perfection. Moreover, there is no probability in the Opinion of *Sutor*, and *De Escalante*, who believes that St. *Jerom*, spake not in those places according to his own Judgment, but according to that of others : Now there is nothing more easie than plainly to prove the contrary, inasmuch that the later is compelled to wave this Answer : But that which he subjoyns is yet more improbable ; he pretends that this Learned Father changed his Opinion after mature Deliberation, and having made more accurate Reflections than formerly, he translated the same Passages in his Version, otherwise than he had done in his other Works. *Hieronymum in translatione sua edenda, rebus penitus inspectis & serius consideratis suam sententiam mutasse.* But this needs no Confutation : St. *Jerom* on the contrary is not generally so punctual in his Correction of the Ancient *Latin* Edition as in other Places, where he is much more critical.

To all the Reasons above produced this may be added, that seems to me to be very efficacious ; we find no other Name in the most Ancient MSS. Copies of our *Latin* Bible that are now extant but that of St. *Jerom*. They that made a Collection of them, call it the *Bibliotheca*, the Library or Bible of St. *Jerom*, to distinguish it from the other Bible that was read before his Time in the Western Countries ; this last contained the

Stun. Am.
tapol. adv.
Jac. Fabr.

Ferd. De
Escal. clyp.
Conc. lib.
6. c. 16.

Ancient Vulgar, no part of which is left to us, appertaining to the New Testament. The new Edition of this Father meeting with a more general Approbation than the *Italic*, it was placed in the Libraries with his Name; which was the Cause that afterwards the other was entirely neglected; and the Psalms were only preserved, being sung in the Churches; but there are also several *Latin* MSS. Bibles, in which the Version of the Psalms is inserted, that was composed from the *Hebrew* by this learned Man: The People were then so thoroughly perswaded that all his Translations were more exact than the Ancient; at least they are less barbarous and less perplexed: Moreover, Private Persons that could not judge of its exactness with respect to the Original, abandoned their Old Version to procure this of St. *Jerom* that was more clear. However, the precise Time when it was first preferred, cannot be determined, since it obtained Credit by little and little, especially when St. *Gregory* was Pope and *Isidore* Bishop of *Sevil*, who began to give Reputation to his New Edition, nevertheless, without altogether rejecting the Ancient. *S. autem Isidorus* (say the Censors of Rome) *Præf. Bibl. Clem. viii. non uno in loco Hieronymianam ceteris omnibus anteponit, eamque ab Ecclesiis Christianis communiter recipi ac probari affirmat, quod sit in verbis clarior & veracior.* St. *Isidore* in several Places prefers the Edition of St. *Jerom* before all others, and affirms, That it was generally Received and Approved by the Christian Churches, as being clearer in its Expressions and more true. But in regard that it was very chargeable to purchase Manuscript Books, to avoid this great Expence, the People chose rather to copy out the Version of St. *Jerom* than the Ancient, insomuch that the Libraries were soon filled with them, and the Divines that had almost no other Copies, were obliged to make use of these, and to interpret them in their Commentaries and other Works, (f) *Remigius, Beda, Rabanus, Haimo, Anselm, Petrus Damiani, Richardus, Hugo*, and finally all the other Ecclesiastical Writers for above 900 Years, have so far adhered to the New Edition, that all the other Versions which were formerly very numerous, have been entirely lost, at least as to their Use. These are, in few Words, the true Reasons of the Authority attributed for many Ages throughout all the Western Country, to the Version that is called the *Vulgar*; which will be more apparent in the sequel of this Discourse, wherein we shall exhibit the History of the Manuscript Copies of this Translation.

If some Modern Divines had applied themselves to the examination of these Matters of Fact from Authentic Records, they would not have

(f) *Remigius, Beda, Rabanus, Haimo, Anselmus, Petrus Damiani, Richardus, Hugo, Rupertus, Petrus Lombardus, Alexander, Albertus, Thomas, Bonaventura, ceterique omnes qui his nongentis annis in Ecclesia floruerunt, S. Hieronymi versione ita sunt usi, ut ceteræ quæ pene innumerabiles erant quasi lapsæ de manibus Theologorum penitus obsolerent.* *Præf. Bibl. Clem. VII.*

propounded so many intricate Questions on this Subject, that often proceed meerly from their own Imaginations. Can any thing be invented that hath less Foundation than all the Questions that *Petrus Sutor* of the Order of St. Bruno, and a Divine of Paris hath produced in his Treatise of the Translation of the Bible, wherein he condemns the late Versions? He affirms, That since that of St. Jerom was publicly read throughout all the Western Churches, we ought to conclude from thence that it was written by Divine Inspiration. If it be objected, That St. Jerom himself hath put a Difference between a Prophet and an Interpreter; he replies, That mention is made in that Place only of ordinary Interpreters, and not of extraordinary. Certainly this Father did not know that he was of the number of these Extraordinary and Inspir'd Interpreters, when he said, *Aliud est esse vatem, aliud interpretem.* De Escalante, a Spanish Divine, believed, (g) That a Spirit of Charity excited St. Jerom to translate the Old Testament from the Hebrew Text, and that a Spirit of Obedience obliged him to revise the New, according to the Greek, and denies that he composed these Versions in the Quality of a Prophet; this Spirit of Charity and Obedience was sufficient (according to his Opinion) to prevent him from inserting any thing therein, that could be suspected to be false. There is nothing hitherto in the Arguments of this Doctor that contradicts good Sense, but he afterwards falls into the same Error as Sutor; and avouches, That it was necessary that St. Jerom should correct this Translation, to make it perfect, and that this Correction was performed with the Divine Assistance, because the Church could not possibly approve a Version that was not inspired. *Præterea dicendum est, quod quamvis translatio Hieronymi lumine Divino ab ipso traducta non fuerit; correctæ tamen & approbata Divina assistentia censetur. Id enim Editioni Vulgatæ concedere oportet, quia Ecclesia in ejus approbatione errare non potuit.* As if the Correction that he pretends to have been made by St. Jerom, and that of the Censors of Rome were exempt from the least Defects.

That which hath led some Divines into this Extremity, is, that they could not apprehend, that the Vulgar, which was declared Authentic by the Council of Trent, should not be perfectly exact. This hath caused De Escalante to avouch, (h) That this Council having defined

Petr. Sutor
de Tral.
Bibl. &
novar.
reprob.
interp.
edit. Paris.
an. 1525.
c. 10.

De Esc.
ibid.

(g) *Negare non possumus translationem Veteris Testamenti de Hebræo in Latinum a spiritu charitatis processisse, & interpretationem Novi de Græco a spiritu obedientiæ. Negamus tamen illas translationes profluxisse ab instinctu Spiritus Sancti in genere Prophetiæ. Iste autem charitatis spiritus & obedientiæ sufficiens quidem fuit ut Hieronymus nihil subdola interpretatione celaverit ex fontibus unde hauerat, neque sciens adjecerit, subtraxerit vel mutaverit ex his quæ in Hebræica varietate Veteris Testamenti, aut Græca Novi, & aliis Græcis libris transfuderit.* De Escal. Clymp. Conc. lib. 6. c. 23.

(h) *Si igitur Concilium Tridentinum definierit Editionem Vulgatam esse authenticam, ac proinde fidem atque veracem, consequens est quod definiat etiam in ea, quoad omnia loca, veram esse scripturam a Spiritu Sancto inspiratam. Nam si in aliqua particula deficeret, aut aliquis in illa error lateret, non dicenda esset authentica, nec fideliter translata.* De Esc. ibid. c. 22.

the Vulgar to be Authentick, and consequently Faithful and True, hath decreed at the same time, that it was true and inspired Scripture in every individual part thereof; for the Name as authentic could not be given thereto, if it admitted any Faults. But I have already explained in the Critical History of the Old Testament, and elsewhere, in what Sense the Bishops assembled at *Trent* have determined that the Vulgar is Authentick: And that which hath been there declared concerning the Old Testament may be applied to the New. I shall only add here, that this *Spanish* Doctor would have acted more prudently, if he had taken the part of those other Divines whom he mentions in this place, attributing to them the Qualifications of Pious and Catholic; nevertheless, they do not believe that the Vulgar is so complete and accurate that no Fault can be found therein. (i) *It is enquired (saith he) whether all the Passages of the Vulgar were translated with such exactness that it comprehends the Holy Scripture in every particular; concerning which Matter we have not Disputes only with Heretics, but also with some Catholic and pious Persons, who believe that the Vulgar Edition doth not faithfully contain the true Original of the H. Scripture in some Places, that have no Regard to Faith and Good Manners.*

De Esc.
init. Clymp.
Conc.

It is very Strange that *De Escalante* should not embrace this Opinion in a Work, wherein he professes to give Instructions to Illiterate Preachers; who having no knowledge of the Languages, nor of sound Divinity, frequently expose themselves to the Laughter of their Auditors, and especially of Heretics. *Hereticus (saith he) linguas plurimas callens, v. g. Hebraicam, Chaldaicam, Syriacam, Gracam, &c. insultat concionatoribus istis, qui unius solius Latinis & illius vix quidem facultate exornantur.* But it is to be feared that these Heretics have so much Skill in the Greek and Latin Tongues as to be able to convince him that he doth not sufficiently understand the Subject on which he Treats, when he affirms, That there is no Passage in the Version of *St. Jerom*, that is not Scripture divinely inspired. *Credendum est (saith this Author, arguing against the above-mentioned Divines) quidquid illi aliter aut dixerint aut scripserint, Latinam Editionem qua utitur Ecclesia adeo fideliter versam esse ut nullus locus sit in quo non sit Scriptura divinitus inspirata.*

Id. ibid.
c. 22.

The Fathers of the Council never had this *Idea* when they preferred *St. Jerom's* Edition before all the others that were published in the Latin Tongue, and ordered it to be revised; and the Popes that took care of this Reformation employed not Prophets, but Critics, who did not pre-

(i) *Inquiratur utrum omnia loca adeo fideliter versa fuerint, ut in omnibus particulis Sacra Scriptura comprehendatur, de qua re non solum est nobis negotium cum hereticis, verum etiam cum aliquibus viris Catholicis & piis, qui sentiunt Editionem Vulgatam quibusdam in locis ad fidem & bonos mores non attinentibus Sacra Scripturae veritatem fideliter non continere.*
De Esc. ibid. c. 22.

tend to be Infallible, since they confess, That they have left some Faults in their Correction: Whence then can this Infallibility proceed, unless from the imagination of certain modern Divines, who not having diligently studied this Matter, have had recourse to I know not what Reasons of Convenience, not considering that some Protestants would make use of their weakness to defame the Council of *Trent*? *Spain* is the place where the Authority of the Vulgar is principally Extolled, and the Rigour of the Inquisition seems to stop the mouth of all People in that Country; however, the most Learned *Spanish* Divines have Explained the Decree of this Council in a very moderate Sense, and *de Escalante* himself is much more reasonable in this Affair, than the above said *Petrus Sutor*: For altho he is persuaded that there is no fault in the Vulgar, yet he doth not cease to believe (k) that the Church in approving this Edition hath not rejected the Originals, and that the Heretics impose on us in this particular; therefore it is Lawful (even according to his Judgment) to appeal to the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Text, by which the *Latin* may be illustrated in many places.

But if we hearken to *Sutor*, we ought no longer to talk of the *Greek* nor of the *Hebrew*; the Vulgar alone is sufficient without the assistance of any other Bible, *Biblia Vulgata ita sufficiens, ut nulla alia quovis modo sit opus*. He insists that the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Text might indeed be consulted in the time of *St. Augustin*, because there was then an infinite number of *Latin* Versions; but that this scrutiny is unreasonable at present: He will not so much as allow that the Variations of the *Latin* Copies should be compared together, in regard that there is too great a difference amongst them; and this diversity is more hurtful than serviceable to find out the Truth: He proceeds even to condemn *Erasmus* as an Heretic for avouching that *St. Jerom*, as a Man, might be deceived; *Hieronymum ut hominem errare potuisse*. He pretends that this Father was Inspired by God, because the Interest of the whole Church was concerned: *Publica res Ecclesie agebatur*. Lastly, *Sutor*, who seems otherwise to have perused the Works of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, confidently affirms that the knowledge of Languages is useless in the Explication of the Holy Scriptures; he inveighs against those that study them, and severely censures the design that was then in agitation to erect a School for the teaching of three Languages. *Ineptum est igitur propterea velle trilinguam scholam suscitare*. Good God! in what condition should we be, if the Popes were animated with the Spirit of this *Parisian* Divine who wrote be-

Petr. Sut.
de Tral.
Bibl. c. 17.

(k) Notandum est Ecclesiam, dum hanc Editionem approbaverit, fontes non reprobasse, ut falso mentiuntur heretici. Unde licitum est ad eos recurrere qui puri sunt in pluribus casibus, precipue quando in Editione Vulgata anceps sententia est; in Græco vero & Hebræo perspicua & clara. De Escal. ibid. c. 23.

fore the Convocation of the Council of *Trent*? But (praised be God) we have had since that time, very able Critics in the *Latin* Church, that have not only taken pains in studying the Languages, but also in conferring a great number of the *Latin* Copies of our *Vulgar*, and in examining them by the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Originals. The Popes themselves and the Cardinals have not thought this Work unworthy of their Care. Moreover, *Sutor* ought to have been content to condemn with the Divines of *Paris*, the new Translations in the *Vulgar* Tongue, which began to cause great Controversies in Religion, without exclaiming at the same time against the improvement of the knowledge of Languages, and of the Art of Critic. *Erasmus*, whom he Assaulted, might be blamed indeed for maintaining certain Propositions in his Works, that proved afterwards to be contrary to the peace of the Church; but he deserves much Commendation on the account of the Enquiry that he made into the Copies of the New Testament as well *Greek* as *Latin* in a time when the most part of the Divines neglected this study.

It were to be wished that the Protestants had no occasion even at this day to reprehend some of them; because they have not altogether abandoned the opinions of their Brother *Peter Sutor*; they ought rather to follow the Example of another Divine, who after he had vigourously opposed *Erasmus*, freely acknowledged the necessity of studying the Languages and the Critical Science; I mean *Martinus Dorpius* a Professor of Divinity in the University of *Louvain*, where he delivered a Discourse that is inserted at the beginning of his Lectures on the Epistles of *St. Paul*, in which he laments his misfortune that he did not understand the *Greek* Tongue, (1) *They are not to be heard* (saith this Doctor) *that believe that the knowledge of the Greek Tongue is not very useful in the Explication of the New Testament, for if it were so, why doth St. Jerom, St. Augustin, St. Ambrose, and in a word, all the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers exhort us so often to have recourse to the Greek Copies as the Originals?* He represents in the same place a strange picture of Scholastic Divinity, at least of the manner of studying it in his time, which is not much different from the method that is used at this day. *We believe* (saith he) *that we have done nothing, unless we turn over the Books of all Authors, that is to say, unless we unhappily lose our time during ten whole years in studying things that are altogether unprofitable.*

Id. Ibid. *Nihil nobis actum esse videtur, nisi omnes omnium chartas evolvamus, hoc est, nisi solido decennio infelicissime ac sine fructu nugemur.* He describes

(1) Neque enim audiendos censeo qui lingue Græcæ cognitionem perparum asserere momenti existimant ad Novi Testamenti explicationem. Nam hoc si habet, quid est quod Hieronymus, Augustinus, Ambrosius, totaque corona veterum eorundemque clarissimorum auctorum toties hortantur, ut Græca exemplaria & archetypa inspiciamus? Mart. Dorp. Orat. in Præl. Ep. Paul. edit. Basil. ann. 1520:

the questions that are propounded in the Divinity Schools so Naturally, as also the manner of Debating them, that I shall chuse rather to rehearse his own words than to Translate them into our Language, in which they would lose somewhat of their Elegancy. *Cur omnem atatem* (adds this Divine) *questiunculis de lana caprina & ibid. ipsam asini umbram superantibus perdimus? Cur sophisticarum captionum nullus est neque modus neque finis, sed perpetua quadam argutandi, plicandi & replicandi libido, & titillantis quidem, sed heu nimio constatura vanitatis inanis oblectatio?*

Dorpius makes these Complaints only against the Divines of his Time, who neglected the Study of Languages and of the Art of Critic, under pretence that the Vulgar Translation made by St. *Jerom* was sufficient without amusing themselves with the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Originals; this obliged him, for the gaining of greater Credit to his Assertions, to cite a Book that Cardinal *Peter d' Ailli* Composed on this very Subject, which he had read only in Manuscript. This Cardinal (saith he) highly extols the Vulgar Edition; but he is constrained to confess (*m*) that it was requisite that it should be Corrected, and that none ought to be Employed in this Work, but Divines that were very expert in the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Tongues. This Cardinal subjoyns in the same Book, that divers persons having presumed by their own Authority to Reform the *Latin* Copies, considerable Errors happened therein; he also accuseth the Church of *Rome* of being very remiss in this as well as many other particulars.

The *Louvain* Doctor, after having related these words of the Cardinal of *Cambray*, which ought to make a deep impression on the minds of Divines, concludes from hence, that it cannot be denied, but that our *Latin* Edition of the New Testament abounds with Faults, and that it ought to be Corrected by the *Greek*; he acknowledges that he was formerly of the contrary Opinion, and that he ever opposed *Erasmus* upon this account; but after having perused (saith he) with greater attention the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, and the Authors of our time who have Treated upon this subject; more particularly, a Letter which Sir *Thomas More* wrote to me, I composed purposely on this occasion, a little Book Entituled * *Of the* * De Co-Reformation of the Sacred Books, which I dictated publickly in the Divi-
nity School of *Louvain*.
dicibus Sac-
cris refor-
mandis.

The zeal which these two Divines have shewn for procuring more correct Copies than those that were in their time, deserves to be com-

(*m*) *Propter exempla corruptionis quæ in Biblia inveniuntur, & alia multa ejusmodi, expedit exemplaria Sacri Canonis examinari diligenter & corrigi. Ad quam correctionem non sunt omnes indifferenter admiuendi, sed solum Theologi multum in Grammatica & linguis Hebræa & Græca eruditi. Petr. Alliac. Card. Camerac. apud Mart. Dorp. ibid.*

mended ; but if they had taken the pains to search out the best *Latin* Manuscripts, they had not perhaps cried out so much as they did against the Negligence of the Church of *Rome* ; besides that (as I have already observed elsewhere) the *Latins* have had their Critics in the most dark and barbarous Ages. It is not always the most sure way to Correct the *Latin* of the New Testament by the *Greek*, we must have recourse even to the most ancient MSS. of the *Latin* Bible of St. *Jerom* ; and the *Greek* ought to be our Guide, when these Copies do not agree among themselves. I know not whether *Dorpius* hath published the Book that he promised, *Of the Reformation of the Vulgar* : But I can certainly affirm that the Method which he follows is not exact ; he declares for Example, that St. *Ambrose* read the *Vulgar* after one manner, St. *Jerom* after another, and that this last hath also reformed it in many places. Moreover, that the modern Divines, of whom St. *Thomas* is the chief, does not always Cite it after the same manner ; from whence he concludes, that to avoid these variations that a new Translation ought to be made from the *Greek*. (n) *All the ancient Fathers* (saith he) *have differently Cited an infinite number of passages of the Scripture : What mischief hath thence accrued to the Church ? If there never happened any, what danger is there to be feared at present ?*

When it was objected to him that the *Grecians* being fallen into many Heresies, we cannot any longer rely on their Copies of the New Testament ; he replied, that *Peter d' Ailli* acknowledged that the Church of *Rome* hath been negligent on this occasion, *Aliacensis Cardinalis fatetur Romanam Ecclesiam in hoc fuisse indiligentem*. He grants *Dorp. ibid.* nevertheless that the *Greek* Copies are not exempt from faults, but insists that they are much fewer than in the *Latin*. *Ut sunt alicubi menda apud Græcos, ita multo sunt pauciores*. He proves by the example of *Arius*, and his followers, that it was not customary amongst the Heretics to corrupt the Text of the Holy Scriptures, and that the *Manicheans*, who altered it in some places, are rather to be esteemed mad men than Hereticks. *Neque unquam accusatus fuit Arius, aut sectatores ejus quod codices falsassent*. Lastly, Forasmuch as this Divine Writ before the Convention of the Council of *Trent*, and (o) it being represented to him, that the *Vulgar* was authorised by Councils, he protested that he was ready to receive it, if any particular Copy

(n) *Omnes veteres innumera Scripturæ loca semper varie citaverunt : quid inde periculi fuit unquam Ecclesiæ Dei ? Si nullum unquam fuit, cur nunc magis futurum est ? Mart. Dorp. ibid.*

(o) *Quod a multis assertur, hanc esse a synodis comprobata, accedam sane, si vel una proferatur synodus quæ ullam de hoc mentionem fecerit. Denique si ullum exemplar proferatur quod fuerit comprobata. Nam quod fuisset illud ? meumne an tuum ? hujus an illius Ecclesiæ ? Comprobat Ecclesia sacros codices, sed emendatos, sed puros ac sinceros. Mendosos vult castigari. Mart. Dorp. ibid.*

that had been approved, were produced ; for what Copy (saith he) should this be, yours or mine ? of this or of that Church ? The Church allows no other Edition of the Bible but those that are correct, pure and sincere, and requires that the faults should be corrected.

To answer to these reasons, that carry an appearance of truth, and are propounded by a Divine that was not intoxicated with the common opinions of his time ; I affirm first, that nothing can be concluded from the examples of St. *Jerom* and St. *Ambrose*, who differ in citing the *Latin* Version of the New Testament. These Fathers understanding the *Greek* tongue, might not exactly follow the *Vulgar* Edition ; the same thing is permitted to be done even at this day, provided it be not practised in public Actions, in which (according to the decree of the Council of *Trent*) the uniformity of interpretation ought to be preserved. Moreover, the differences that are found in the Books of St. *Thomas Aquinas* and of the other Scholastical Divines, are only various readings of one and the same Translation : As for the assertion of Cardinal d' *Ailli*, his whole design was, that the *Latin* Copies that were full of faults, should be corrected ; he did not insist that they ought entirely to be altered by the *Greek* ; for this would be rather to make a New Translation of the New Testament, than to reform the Old. I agree with *Dorpius*, that the *Arians* and other ancient Sectaries have not falsified the Sacred Writings on purpose to adapt them to their erroneous opinions, and I have likewise proved it in the first part of this Critical History ; I grant also that the sole use of the *Vulgar* was not decreed in any Council before his time, neither was this necessary to authorize it, since according to the Maxims of Civilians, Custom hath the same force as a Law ; this Custom that continued 900. years is mentioned in the Preface of the Edition of *Clement VIII.* and the Bishops assembled at *Trent* had regard to it, when they preferred the Edition of St. *Jerom*, before all the other *Latin* Versions. *Petrus Sutor* who wrote before this Council, had reason to affirm, that the *Vulgar* would be Authentick, tho it were not composed by St. *Jerom* ; *Vulgatam, etsi non esset Hieronymi, semper fore authenticam.* He mistakes only in this point, in pretending that it was inspired ; for an Act may be authentick and obtain credit, without perfectly corresponding with the Original in every circumstance.

Dorpius in demanding some particular approved Copy of the *Vulgar* to be produced, discovers an acute rather than a solid judgment. It is certain that the custom of the *Latin* Church hath authorised no *Latin* Copy in particular, but only the Edition of St. *Jerom* in general ; and it cannot be denied but that the Copies of this Edition are very different one from another ; however, this defect is common to all Books in the world, and we endeavour to supply it by the usual methods of the Critical Art : The Church having no Prophets that might be consulted on occasion, hath recourse to these or-

dinary means ; and this order the Council of *Trent* hath most judiciously enjoined, which hath been since put in execution with a great deal of prudence. Lastly, the arguments alledged by *Dorpius* do not prove that we ought to abandon the old Version received in the *Latin* Church, to admit none for the future, but such as some private men shall think fit to dictate from the *Greek*. Every Church hath always had a certain and determined Translation, which was constantly read in the publick Assemblies, and indeed it could not happen otherwise ; however this never hindered private persons from making new Versions, all which are in some measure useful ; but it would not be expedient to substitute them in the place of those that have been generally allowed by an ancient Custom.

The *Lowvain* Divine may be permitted in this sense, in his Lectures on the Epistles of *St. Paul* to make use of illustrations taken from the works of *Valla*, *Erasmus*, and *Jacobus Faber* ; he is to be commended in this, when he declares, that not understanding the *Greek* tongue he hath made application to these three Writers ; being persuaded that the Epistles of *St. Paul* could not be clearly expounded without a competent knowledge of this Language ; neither is there any person capable of judging in this matter that can blame him for proposing to his Brethren not without reproof, the example of the ancient Divines, who for the most part were skilful in divers Languages, at least the *Greek* : *Veteres* (saith *Dorpius*) *quotquot fuere eximii Theologi, alii duo, alii tres, alii plures Linguas calluerunt, Græcam certe nemo fere non mediocriter didicerat, & nos tantopere abhorremus.* But after all, he will never be able to convince any man of good sense, that a Church ought to reject a Version which she hath used for many Ages, under a pretence, that a better might be composed from the Originals. If the Edition of *St. Jerom* had not been gradually advanced by the general consent of the Western Churches, above the ancient Translation that was extant before his time, it would not have gained more esteem than those of many other Interpreters : In a word, custom and an universal approbation ought to regulate our judgment in affairs of this nature : therefore there is nothing more reasonable than the Decree of the Bishops assembled at *Trent*, who declared the Edition that was in use for many Ages throughout all the Western Churches, to be Authentick ; it was already become thus *Authentick*, by the means of a long and uninterrupted Custom : Nevertheless that they might not seem to approve faults that were very apparent, they prudently ordained that this Edition should be revised and corrected according to good Copies, without forbidding private persons to consult the Originals for their own particular instruction.

C H A P. VIII.

Of the Manuscript Copies of the Vulgar Edition: The most able Divines fall into great errors for want of applying themselves to the study of the Art of Critic: We have no MSS. Copies of the Italic Version of the Old Testament now remaining, and but very few of the New: Some light is given from the Writings of Cassiodorus as to what concerns the ancient Manuscripts of the Latin Bibles.

Since we have discoursed at large in the first part of this Work, concerning that which relates to the *Greek* Manuscripts of the New Testament, and have therein observed their good and bad qualities; we shall perform the same Task here, with respect to the *Latin* Manuscript Copies. This undertaking is so much the more difficult, in regard that a private person can hardly procure so great a number of Manuscripts as is requisite to form a just *Idea* of this matter; nevertheless this is necessary, if we would judge of the innumerable variations of different readings that appear in perusing the *Latin* MSS. Bibles. It is not sufficient then for a man to be a Divine; for the most able Doctors of our Age that have not had an exact knowledge of this Art, have committed very considerable faults. It is known to all the world after what manner the Author that concealed himself under the name of *Petrus Aurelius* hath treated Father *Sirmondus* on the account of matters that were purely critical; he arrogantly sends him back to his Grammar as if this learned Jesuit had been capable of no other employment; but he soon convinced him that a Grammarian is more expert in distinguishing the true readings of Manuscript Books from false, than a Divine that thinks himself well accomplished, because he is endowed with the quality of a Doctor. *In emendandis Libris* (saith *Sirmondus*) *sincerius interdum, certiusque praeat (judicium) solers Grammaticus, quam tumidus ac turgidus inani titulo & ostentatione, non scientia Theologus.* Sirm. in antirr. p. 48.

I do not presume to reckon *Aurelius* in the number of these Divines; my design is only to shew that the most judicious men of this Profession are often deceived for want of being sufficiently exercised in the study of the Critical Science: This will be evident if we look into the Works of these two famous Authors: *Aurelius* who refers all things to the principles of Divinity, argues with little judgment in disputes concerning matters that appertain to critical enquiries; seeing he hath

no certain method by which he might judge of Manuscripts, he is inclined to follow his opinions rather than the rules of Art; having compiled a system of Divinity after his own fashion, he finds out Heresies that have no other foundation but his particular notions. *Sirmondus* on the contrary, who was well versed in the perusing of Manuscript Books disproves these pretended Heresies by establishing the true and genuin readings of the Manuscripts. I have here produced the example of *Aurelius*, because this Divine, who almost wholly makes use of Common-places in opposition to *Sirmondus*, affirms perhaps with a little too much liberty, that there is so great a corruption in all the Bibles, that it is impossible to rectifie them, not even by the help of Manuscripts. (a) *There is not (saith this Author) any Edition of the Bible, whether it be Latin, Greek or Hebrew, that hath not been so altered by the Transcribers in all the MSS. Copies; that there remains no way to remedy these corruptions in the most part of the places where these alterations have happened.* (b) *Do you not see (subjoins Aurelius, speaking to Father Sirmondus) that as we oblige Hereticks to abandon the Scripture, from which they cannot disintangle themselves, and to fly to the authority of the Church: after the same manner, in those places where the Manuscripts are altered, you ought also to have recourse to the rule of truth, to the light that is given us by the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, and to Tradition? By this we must judge of the different readings that are in Manuscripts; and therefore it is necessary that you should prefer with me this authority before the Manuscripts, which you seem to propound as the only certain Rule.*

But this method that seems to attribute all to the authority of Tradition, and nothing to the Manuscript Copies is subject to illusion. Indeed *Aurelius*, who did not much esteem Manuscripts, in a controversy relating to the reading of a Canon of the Council of *Orange*, fell into opinions that cannot be justified, under colour of defending the common persuasion of the Divines of his time. Father *Sirmondus*, who did not believe that the Manuscript Books ought to be disjoined from Tradition, judged that that which this Author called by that name, was not a true and certain Tradition, since there were ancient Acts that contradicted it. Wherefore it is not safe to separate the MSS. Copies of

(a) Nullam esse constat (Bibliorum) editionem, non Latinam, non Græcam, non Hebræam, quæ non in universis MSS. librorum vitio ita sit depravata tum additamentis, tum imminutionibus, tum inversionibus, tum immutationibus variis, ut nihil operis ad eas sanandas in manuscriptis ullis reperiatur; quod ad illorum plerasque universi consentiant & conspirent. Petr. Aur. in Anæ. in 8vo. p. 233.

(b) Nonne vides quemadmodum hæreticos, omisso Scripturæ textu, cujus exitum nullum reperiunt, ad Ecclesiæ auctoritatem redigimus? Ita tibi in hujusmodi locis confugiendum est ad varietatis normam, ad majorum lucem, ad traditionis stabilitatem, & ex ea vel de discrepantibus libris, vel de conspirantibus ad errorem ferendam esse sententiam, adeoque auctoritatem illam quam ego manuscriptis præposui, tibi quoque illis præponendam, nec supremam & unicam, quod velle videris, haberi posse manuscriptorum legem. Aur. ibid.

the Bible from the Traditions of the Church; these two things ought, as it were, to join hand in hand. In a word, the Scripture, as I have observed elsewhere, is the rule of Law, and the illustration that may be taken from the Works of the ancient Ecclesiastical Authors, are the rule of matter of fact, and the obscurity that is found in this first rule, is enlightned by the second.

There is nothing that hath less foundation than the impeachment exhibited by *Aurelius* against Father *Sirmondus*, (c) for imitating the Hereticks in this particular, who to exclude the authority of the Church adhere so strictly to the Text of the Bible, that they pretend thereby to remove all obscurity, without any other assistance, and to decide all matters depending on Religion, only by consulting the Greek and Hebrew Originals. My design at present is not to vindicate Father *Sirmondus*, nor to shew that he was injured in comparing his method with that of the Hereticks: The reasons that he hath produced in his answers do sufficiently wipe off this reproach, and prove at the same time, that the most able Divines, who are altogether guided by their own notions of Divinity, without an exact knowledge of the Art of Critic, are obnoxious to considerable errors. This hath obliged me to examin the qualifications of our *Latin* M SS. Bibles; and in regard that they are ancient, and have been taken from the Originals, they may be of very great use in clearing the difficulties of the Holy Scriptures.

Petrus Pithæus assures us, that the Churches and Monasteries have preserved even to this day, the Copies of the *Latin* Bible that were used before the time of St. *Jerom*: He declares that he hath seen at *Paris* in the Library of the Abby of St. *Germain des Prez* a Bible almost entire of this sort; as also a *Psalter*, and part of the Gospels. *Hic illud adjeceſſe ſufficiat* (saith he) *ad noſtram etiam atatem antiquiores quaſdam Eccleſias, Monaſteriaque nonnulla, conſervaffe ſibi exemplaria veterum illarum translationum ſive editionum, qua ante Hieronymi atatem in uſu fuerant, atque inter cætera videre hodieque eſt integra fere Biblia minori-bus literis, ſed & Pſalterium iis quas unciales vocarunt argenteis, partem etiam Evangeliorum aureis, utraque in purpureis membranis deſcripta inter reliquias librorum Monaſterii S. Germani Pariſienſis, qua Beati illius Praſulis fuiſſe poſteri per manus ſibi traditum aſſerunt.* However, I believe

Pet. Pith.
de Lat. SS.
Bibl. in-
terp.

(c) Uteris prorsus argumento hæreticorum, ut quemadmodum illi ad excludendam Ecclesiæ autoritatem Scripturæ textum ita mordicus tenent, ut solo illo, quamlibet ipsius ambiguitatem & obscuritatem tolli contendant, collatis inter se locis, & universum Religionis caput ad Græcos & Hebræicos revocent fontes, ex quibus omnia componi & decidi posse aſſerunt. Sic tu ad eludendam vim veritatis, majorumque rerum lucem, quam ego manuscriptis præposui, & ex qua eorum sanitatem spectandam esse dixi, ita illos taeris, ut sola ipsorum inter se collatione, mutuisque auxiliis eorum labes elui, & vulnera sanari posse affirmes. Ergo quanta est hæreticorum in illo effato absurditas & cavillatio, tanta in hoc tuo argumento. *Aurel. ibid.* P. 230, & 232.

that this learned Critic is mistaken, for there are not any of these Manuscript Copies of the *Latin Bible* in the Abbey of *St. Germain*, in which the Books of the Old Testament are comprized according to the ancient Version that was read before the time of *St. Jerom*: there are only some few written with sufficient exactness in these small characters described by him, which contain the Edition of *St. Jerom*: As for the Psalter, it cannot be denied but that we have it of the Old Translation, because it always continued to be read in the Western Churches, nevertheless it is difficult to find it pure, and such as it was in the *Italic*. For *St. Jerom* having revised it by the *Greek Copies* of the *Septuagint*, *Italy*, and afterwards the most part of the other Provinces made use of his correction. Therefore the Transcribers that inserted the ancient Psalter in their Collections of the *Latin Bible*, have placed it therein with this Title; *The Psalms newly corrected by St. Jerom Priest; emendati a B. Hieronymo Presbytero in novo*. The Psalms of the *Italic* Edition are more pure in the Text than *St. Augustin* hath annexed to his Commentaries on this Book, than in any Manuscript that we have at present.

As for what relates to the *Latin MSS.* Copies of the New Testament, I do not believe that there are any others extant, but those that I have already mentioned elsewhere, viz. the Copy of *Cambridge*, wherein are comprehended the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, and that of *Clermont* in the King's Library, which contains the Epistles of *St. Paul*, and is indeed the other part of the *Cambridge Copy*: We have besides this, in the Library of *St. Germain des Pres* an excellent Manuscript of the Epistles of *St. Paul*, that differs but very little from that of the King's Library, saving that it is fairer and more exact. *Lucas Brugensis* in his Critical Notes on the New Testament, cites two ancient Copies that agree more frequently with the ancient Vulgar, than with the Edition of *St. Jerom*.

Cassiodorus, who lived in the beginning of the sixth Century, neglected nothing that might tend to the preservation of Correct Copies, especially those of the Bible. It appears from his great diligence in these kinds of Collections, that even in that time the Transcribers were not very exact; this obliged him to compile a summary of divers Authors that treated of Orthography: The Monks whom he employed in copying out the Old Books, represented to him, that it was to no purpose to know what the Ancients had done, if they did not understand how to write their Books: *Monachi mei subito clamare ceperunt, Quid prodest cognoscere nos vel quae antiqui fecerunt, vel ea quae sagacitas vestra addenda curavit nosse diligenter, si quemadmodum ea scribere debeamus omnimodis ignoramus, nec in voce nostra possumus reddere, quod in scriptura comprehendere non valemus?* This famous Monk commends those that took great pains and care in transcribing the Sacred Books, there being nothing more useful for the propagation of Religion.

Cassiod.
Prolog. in
Orthogr.

Religion. *Tot vulnera* (saith he) *Satanas accipit, quot antiquarius Do-* Id. lib. de
mini verba describit. Moreover, he prescribes rules that ought to be Div. Lett.
 observed in procuring accurate Copies, for (as he subjoins) what be- c. 30.
 nefit can there be obtained from a great number of Books that are
 not correct? *Quid prodest multas transcribere lectiones, & ea quæ sunt* Ibid. c. 14.
probabiliter corrigenda nescire? Therefore he thinks it convenient that
 those persons that were well educated, should be enjoined to write
 what others who were less skilful, had transcribed; *A paucis doctisque*
faciendum est, quod simplici & minus erudita congregationi noscitur esse præ-
parandum. Lastly, he highly extols this Critical Science which he
 judges not to be unworthy of the study of the most learned men.
Istud enim genus eruditionis (saith he in the same place) *valde pulcher-*
rimum est, & doctissimorum hominum gloriosum.

It was necessary to make all these reflections, that serve to distin-
 guish the best readings in the Manuscripts: We ought not to be surpris-
 ed if we sometimes find innumerable faults in Copies that are writ-
 ten with a very fair hand; for the greater part of the Transcribers
 were persons chosen with respect to their skill in Writing, rather
 than to their Learning or other qualifications; insomuch that some
 corrected their Books afterwards when it could be conveniently done;
 hence proceeds the great number of Corrections that are in the Co-
 pies of *Cambridge*, *Clermont* and the Abby of *St. Germain*, which I
 have often mentioned, part whereof is generally as ancient as the
 writing of these Books, in which we frequently see several words blot-
 ted out, others changed or added, and some subjoined in the bottom
 of the page, as if they had been forgotten in transcribing them, and it
 may be easily discovered that the most part of these additions was
 written with the same hand as the Body of the Book, because the Revisers
 caused them to be inserted therein from other Copies that they thought
 to be more correct. There were for example, at that time certain
Latin Copies of the New Testament after the same manner as they
 had been corrected by *St. Jerom*; for the Revisers, who were perswa-
 ded that they were more exact than the ancient, reformed them by
 this Edition; this they did equally in the *Greek* and in the *Latin*; for
 it was the custom then to have recourse to the Original, by which
 they took the liberty even to correct the *Latin*; this hath apparently
 given occasion to these old Copies of the New Testament, wherein we
 see the *Greek* on the one side and the *Latin* on the other. The same
 thing hath been observed with respect to the Psalms, of which some
 Copies are found of the same nature, tho' they are very scarce. *Cas-*
siodorus whose principal design was to furnish a Library of *Latin* Au-
 thors, or of Books translated into that Language, placed therein for
 this reason some *Greek* Writings, and among others the *Greek* Septu-
 agint Bible, divided into LXXV Books: This he did (as he himself
 declares) to follow the Maxim of *St. Augustin*, who believed that the

Latin Copies as well of the Old as of the New Testament ought to be corrected by the Greek. Sed quoniam (saith Cassiodorus) Pater Augustinus in
Cassiod. ibid. c. 14. Libro II. de Doctrina Christiana commonet ita dicens, Latini codices Vete-
ris Novique Testamenti, si necesse fuerit, Græcorum auctoritate corrigendi sunt, unde & nobis post Hebræum fontem translatio cuncta pervenit, ideoque vobis & Græcum Pandecten reliqui comprehensum in libris 75.

It may be concluded from hence, that private persons were then permitted to correct the *Latin Copies* of the *New Testament* by the *Original Greek*; and this is the reason that we find many ancient Copies that have been altered with too much liberty in certain places where the *Latin* ought to be preferred before the *Greek*; as for example, in the sixth Chapter of *St. Matthew*, v. 13. the expression hath been unadvisedly added at the end of the *Lords Prayer*, in some *Latin Copies*, *quia tuum est regnum, & potentia, & gloria, in secula, For thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory for ever*, because they are in the *Greek*. But it is easie to judge, that this addition was not inserted in the first *Greek Originals*, altho it is very ancient; it is not found in the old Manuscript of *Cambridge*, nor in one of those of *Robert Stephen*, neither is it in the *Italic*. The *Grecians* in finishing a Lesson of their Office in this place have added these words in their Liturgy, from whence they afterwards passed into their Copies; therefore we read *καὶ τέλος* the end, in the *Cambridge Manuscript* immediately after *καὶ τέλος*, evil, to shew that this is the end of a Lesson; these kinds of Lessons are marked in many *Greek Manuscripts* by the words *ἀρχή* the beginning, and *καὶ τέλος* the end, in the places where they begin and end. It would be too tedious to insist in particular on the Manuscripts of the *New Testament* that have been corrected according to the *Greek* with too much liberty, it is sufficient to observe this in general, that it may serve as a precaution to us when we shall meet with various readings in these Copies.

The esteem that *St. Jerom* acquired in all the Western Countries, was the cause that many reformed the ancient *Latin Copies* by his corrections; and this is the reason that in the works of some Ecclesiastical Writers of his time, we do not find the *Italic Version* of the *New Testament*, so pure as it was before, as may be proved by the Commentaries of *Pelagius*, and of some other Authors. The Transcribers began from that time to copy out *St. Jerom's Latin Version* of the Bible as well as the *Italick*. *Cassiodorus* placeth both these Editions in his Library, divides the Old and New Testament according to that of *St. Jerom* into XLIX. Books, comprehending in the Old, only those that this Father had translated from the *Hebrew*; and thus he seems to have retained in his Copies the ancient translation of the Books of Wisdom: This is worth the observing, because *Lucas Brugenfis* quotes some ancient Bibles, in which the *Latin Version* of those Books was conformable to this old Edition: the same *Cassiodorus* annexed to this, the *Latin Version* of the
 New

New Testament revised by St. Jerom, which was divided into XXVII. Books, *Huic etiam adjecti sunt* (saith he) *Novi Testamenti libri 27. qui* Ibid. *colliguntur simul 49.* He caused this large Collection to be transcribed in small Characters, *Hunc Pandecten propter copiam lectionis minutiore manu . . . asstimavimus conscribendum.*

In his Collection of the ancient *Latin* Translation that was taken from the *Greek* of the LXX. Interpreters, he did not follow the pure *Italic*, but the Edition of St. Jerom, who had corrected the old Version, by affixing thereto certain marks called *Asterisks* and *Obelisks* to denote (in imitation of *Origen*) what ought to be supplied and what blotted out, to make the Text conformable to the Original *Hebream* ; this Ibid. c. 14. is to be understood by the following words of *Cassiodorus*. *Hic textus multorum translatione variatus, sicut in prologo Psalterii positum est, Patris Hieronymi diligenti cura emendatus, compositus & relictus est.* He annexed (d) to this *Latin* Edition of the Septuagint revised by St. Jerom, the old Translation of the New Testament divided into XXVI. Books, and bound them together in a great Volume written with large Characters. It is probable that he reckoned in this ancient Collection, but XXVI. Books of the New Testament, because the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was not contained in the Old Editions, as it may be proved by the Manuscript of *Clermont*, which is in the Kings Library, and by that of the Library of St. *Germain des Prez*. Although this Epistle was received as Divine and Canonical by divers *Latin* Fathers, nevertheless it was not read in the time of St. Jerom in many *Latin* Churches ; and it seems not to have been inserted in the Catalogue of the Canonical Books of the New Testament till after his Edition was published.

It appears from all that hath been above related, that the old *Latin* Version was read in the Western Churches in the time of *Cassiodorus* ; and that this did not hinder the Transcribers from copying out St. Jerom's new Edition with great care and diligence. Forasmuch as the ignorance of the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Languages had caused a great deal of confusion in the old *Latin* Copies, especially with respect to the Orthography and the manner of writing Proper Names, he advised his Monks to consult thereupon the two Editions of this Father. (e) If there are (saith he) any words ill expressed, they may be readily corrected from the two Editions of St. Jerom, or according to the Maxim of St. Au-

(d) Tertia divisio est inter alias in codice grandiore litera grandiore conscripto, qui habet quaterniones nonaginta quinque, in quo Septuaginta Interpretum translatio Veteris Testamenti in libris 44. continetur, cui subjuncti sunt Novi Testamenti libri 26 fiuntque libri 70. Cassiod. ibid. c. 12.

(e) Si tamen alia verba reperiuntur absurde posita, aut ex codicibus quos B. Hieronymus in Editione LXX. Interpretum emendavit, vel quos ipse ex Hebræo transtulit, intrepide corrigenda sunt ; aut sicut B. Augustinus ait, recurratur ad Græcum Pandecten, qui omnem legem divinam dignoscitur continere collectam, vel quibus possibile fuerit Hebræam Scripturam, vel ejus Doctores requirere non detrectent. Cassiod. ibid. c. 15.

gustin, the Greek Copies may be examined, neither ought any scruple to be made, if it were possible, to have recourse to the Hebrew Text, or to those that understand it. Whatsoever esteem the people might then have of St. Jerom and his profound Learning, they durst not as yet introduce his Edition of the Bible into the publick Service of the Church; but were content to transcribe it separately, and to have recourse thereto as occasion served, in reforming the ancient Version in those places that they believed to be corrupted; they made use of it as far as it relates to the Old Testament, after the same manner as the Translation of *Aquila* was read heretofore in the Greek Church; and there was nothing in this practice but what is expedient, because it was necessary (as *Cassiodorus* affirms) to go back to the head of the Fountain, and to correct the Versions by the Original. *Decet enim, ut unde ad nos venit salutaris translatio, inde iterum redeat decora correctio.*

Ibid.

But this Rule that was good in its own nature, afterwards caused a great confusion in the Copies of the Bible that were transcribed by the *Latins*. Those persons that took upon them to be Critics in the Monasteries, from whence almost all the ancient Manuscripts that are now extant have been taken, not being endued with qualifications that are requisite for this employment, have rather corrupted than corrected them in many places; and of this we ought to take heed in observing the various readings that are produced from these Manuscripts. I shall say nothing here concerning the Old Testament; but they that take the pains to examine the two ancient Copies of the Epistles of St. Paul, one of which is in the Kings Library, and the other in that of St. Germain des Prez, will find them all over defaced by the different Corrections that have been made, as well in the Greek as in the Latin: The Rule that *Cassiodorus* prescribed to his Monks hath been followed therein, viz. that the old Edition ought to be boldly corrected according to the Copies of St. Jerom. But this Learned Man did not pretend that it was necessary to cast them into a new Mould, as they have done; he only required them to correct the manifest faults that were in the Orthography, or in the proper names which he calls *verba absurde posita*: his design was not to take away the ancient reading, that the new one of St. Jerom might be substituted in its place, since he purposely caused these two Editions to be copyed out separately in two distinct Volumes, and even in different characters.

I doubt not but that *Beza's* Manuscript, which is at present at Cambridge, is disfigured as much as the two others above-mentioned; but whatever corrections have been made in these MSS. we may very often perceive the ancient reading, that is but half blotted out; for the Revisers have had no regard to the Rule that was given by *Cassiodorus* to those that undertook to correct Books; he desired them to use such art and dexterity in adding new Letters in the room of the others, that

that it might be taken for the same Hand. *Precor etiam vos* (saith ^{Cassiod.} he) *qui emendare presumitis, ut supra adjectas literas ita pulcherrimas* ^{ibid.} *facere studeatis, ut potius ab antiquariis scripta fuisse judicentur.* This was difficult to be performed, when many words were changed at once to render them conformable to St. Jerom's Copies, as it often happened in the Manuscripts of *Clermont* and *St. Germain des Prez*, and even in divers others that are not so ancient. The *Latins* have done the same thing in their Bibles as the *Jews* in their *Hebrew* Copies: it hath been represented in the *Critical History of the Old Testament*, that they have reformed them by the corrections of the *Massora*. And all the difference that there is in this respect between the *Jews* and the *Christians* is, that the former not having any Manuscripts that were written above six or seven hundred years ago, no great number of different readings is found therein; whereas the above-cited Manuscripts of the *New Testament* are at least a thousand years old, I say a thousand, and not twelve or thirteen hundred, because the Characters of these MSS. do not seem to be more ancient. Moreover we see in them certain corrections written at the bottom of the pages, and sometimes in the Margin, with the same hand as the Text, which shew that the new Edition of St. Jerom was then very much approved, since they were taken from it.

Hence it plainly appears, that the Transcribers of these Manuscripts have followed the old Edition of the *New Testament*, as well in the *Greek* as in the *Latin*; after the same manner as it was found in the ancient Copies that were then common in the *Western Countries*: But St. Jerom's Edition being more esteemed at that time, the Revisers of these MSS. thought it convenient to make them conformable thereto, both in the *Greek* and in the *Latin*. For I do not doubt but that they that Copied out the new Version of this Father, have sometimes annexed it to the *Greek*, which he followed and had taken from the *Greek Churches*; and this *Greek* is more pure than that with which the *Italic* agrees. Forasmuch as *Cassiodorus* ordered his Monks always to be guided by the most correct Copies; and since they were persuaded that St. Jerom's Copies were better than the ancient, this is the cause that the old have been corrected by the new. These Books were chiefly kept in the *Monasteries*; whereupon it happened afterwards, that other Monks who were exercised in the *Critical Art*, corrected them again by the Copies of their time; to this we ought to attribute the corrections made by different hands, that are seen in these Manuscripts. Lastly, the new Edition of St. Jerom hath by little and little altogether prevailed over the other, insomuch that the ancient Version of the *New Testament* is very rarely to be found at this day, which hath hardly been preserved in some famous *Monasteries* among the old Books, and since the people desisted from taking any more Copies thereof, it was almost entirely suppressed.

C H A P. IX.

Of the MSS. Copies of the Latin Bible, chiefly those since the VIII, and IX Century. Certain Prefaces have been placed at the beginning of divers Books of the New Testament in these MSS. under the name of St. Jerom, that were not written by this Father ; and among others, that which is prefixed to the Catholic Epistles. New Reflexions on the 7th. verse of the 5th. Chapter of the I. Epistle of St. John. A Commendation of certain Critical Works, called Correctoria Bibliæ.

THE *Italick* Version was as yet generally used in the Western Churches in the time of St. Gregory, who lived in the sixth Century, and died in the beginning of the seventh ; but private persons added to it the Edition of St. Jerom, that was then extant in all the Libraries. The above-said Pope wrote to this effect to Leander Bishop of Sevil, to whom he expressly declares, that the Apostolic See made use of the Old and the New Edition. *Sedes Apostolica cui præsideo utraque translatione utitur.* Nevertheless it may be perceived in his Writings, that he esteemed the New above the Old ; his example being followed throughout all *Italy*, was at last the cause that the later was entirely abandoned. However, this was not done all at once, for it could not happen otherwise but that part of the ancient Edition would be preserved ; some remainders of which are still to be seen in the present *Vulgar*, notwithstanding the corrections of the Censors of *Rome*, who have not altogether purged it from this mixture. It appears also, that Julian, Archbishop of Toledo, who wrote against the Jews of Spain about the end of the VII. Century, preferred the ancient *Vulgar* before St. Jerom's Version, especially in those places that relate to Chronology. He gives the name of *Vulgar* to the *Italick*, inso-much that the new Edition was not then solely used in his Church ; which happened nevertheless soon after. Mariana the Jesuit makes mention of a Manuscript Copy of the *Latin Bible* preserved in the Church of Toledo, that was written in *Gothic* Characters above six hundred years ago ; it is not to be doubted but that it was the new Translation of St. Jerom, since the Version of the Psalms that this Father had composed from the *Hebrew*, was found therein. I have seen in some Libraries the like Manuscripts in *Italian* Characters that were seven and eight hundred years old.

Julian.
Tolet.
adv. Jud.
Tom. 4.
Bibl. Patr.

These fair Manuscript *Latin* Copies are not dated before the reign of *Charlemagne*. For this Prince, who applied himself with extream diligence to restore Learning in the *West*, employed all the most able and accomplished persons that he could find, in correcting the *Latin* Bibles; that were very much altered by the Transcribers in those barbarous times. *Alcuinus* was one of those that had the greatest share in these Critical Enquiries, having received Orders to revise the Books of the Old and New Testament. But that which is most worthy of our observation is, that *Charlemagne* speaks concerning himself, in a Preface that he hath prefixed to the Book of *Homilies* of *Paulus Diaconus*, a Monk of *Mont Cassel*, as if he had corrected the whole Bible; these are the words of this Preface, that very well deserve to be inserted in this place. *Igitur quia cura nobis est, ut Ecclesiarum nostrarum ad meliora semper proficiat status, oblitteratam pene malorum nostrorum defidia reparare vigilantia studio literarum satagimus officinam, & ad pernoscentia sacrorum librorum studia, nostro etiam quos possumus invitamus exemplo, inter quae jam pridem universos Veteris ac Novi Testamenti libros librarium imperitia depravatos, Deo nos in omnibus adjuvante, ex amissim correximus.* He assumes to himself in this Preface, which he dedicates to all his Subjects, the quality of King of the *French* and *Lombards*, and of Lord of the *Romans*. *Karolus Dei fretus auxilio Rex Francorum & Lombardorum ac Patricius Romanorum religiosi lectoribus nostra ditioni subiectis.*

Carol. M.
apud P.
Mabil. in
Anal.tom.
1. P. 25.

Moreover we read in the History of *Thegan*, that this wise Prince corrected before his death, the *Latin* Edition of the New Testament by the *Greek* and *Syriac* Copies. *Quatuor Evangelia Christi, quae intulantur nomine Matthaei, Marci, Lucae & Joannis, in ultimo ante obitus sui diem cum Graecis & Syris optime correxerat.* It is certain, that there were in his time men expert in the *Greek* tongue, but this correction was chiefly performed in the Orthograyhy. Since the most part of the ancient Books were written without any distinction of Points and Comma's, and even often of Words; this caused much confusion in the reading, especially in a time when a great number of Ecclesiastics could hardly read *Latin*. We are partly obliged to the ignorance of those times, for the fairest *Latin* Copies that are extant at present in some Libraries, written with a very curious hand in *Italian* Characters of a middle size: the Text of the *Latin* Bible of *St. Jerom* is not only distinguished therein by Sections, but there are points also and other necessary distinctions.

Theg. de
gestis Lud.
Pii apud
Duch. p.
277.

There is in the Library of the *Benedictin* Monks of *St. Germain des Prez*, an entire Bible in two large Volumes, which a Monk of this Abby believed to have been written under the Reign of this Emperor. This Monk, who is (as I am told) the learned Father *du Breuil*, hath marked with his own hand in this Copy, that it was written in the ninth year of the Empire of *Charlemagne*, *Annoque Domini 809.* He relies

Ex Cod. MSS. Bibl. S. Germ. n. 1. & 2. relies on these words of a Chronicle annexed at the end : *A Carlo & Carlomanno usque ad Carlum sunt anni quatuor, & inde dominus Karolus solus regnum suscepit, & Deo protegente gubernat usque in presentem annum feliciter qui est annus regni ejus 42. imperii autem nonus.* If this Chronicle had ended here, it could not be doubted but that this *Latin Bible* was indeed written in the time of *Charlemagne* ; but these words are read afterwards, *ab Ludovico Imperatore usque ad Hlotarium filium ejus anni 18.* Insomuch that it appears to have been written under the Reign of *Lotharius I I.* Nevertheless a learned Monk of this Abby, who could not make this date conformable to a passage wherein it is expressly mentioned, that *Charlemagne* reigned alone, when this Copy was Transcribed, declared to me as I was reading in this place, that he believed that the last words of the Chronicle were added afterwards. But it is apparent that the whole Chronicle was written at the same time, and with the same hand : Therefore to reconcile these two matters that seem to be so opposite, it may be affirmed that this fair *Latin Bible* was transcribed under the Reign of *Lotharius I I.* from a Copy that was written under that of *Charlemagne* ; the Transcriber hath also inserted the Chronicle which was at the end of the Copy, and ended in the Reign of this Emperor ; And hath afterwards added the other ensuing years that brought it down to his time, insomuch that altho this Bible was not written till the Reign of *Lotharius I I.* yet it may be imputed to that of *Charlemagne*, since it was transcribed from a Copy that was extant at that time.

All the other Bibles that were written under the Reigns of the Successors of *Charlemagne* are like unto the first, except that there are more Prefaces in some than in others, the greatest part of which in process of time have been attributed to *St. Jerom*, tho very few of them were composed by him ; neither is his name found in all ; this depended often on the pleasure of the Copiers. I admire that the most able Critics of our Age have not been aware of this, in reading these ancient Manuscript Bibles that do not agree in this particular. *Petrus Pithaus* who hath read so many MSS. Books, affirms it to be a certain truth, that the Preface inserted in the first Editions of our *Latin Bibles*, before the Canonical Epistles under the name of *St. Jerom* was really composed by him ; it is true, that it is found in the most part of the Manuscripts, but not in the best. They that made Collections of these Bibles under the Reigns of *Charlemagne* and his Successors, imagined that they were not exact, unless they prefixed a Preface to these Books. We have many of these Prefaces written by *St. Jerom* in the Books of the Old Testament, which he translated out of *Hebrew* into *Latin*, or revised by the *Greek*. The same thing was thought requisite to be done in the New, and Prefaces were at first annexed thereto without the Authors name, but the Transcribers afterwards added that of *St. Jerom*. This may be easily discovered by comparing together

gether the old Copies of St. *Jerom's* Bible ; for the most Ancient and most exact have a much lesser number of Prefaces in the New Testament than the others, which not being so ancient nor so pure, have not St. *Jerom's* Name at the head of these Prefaces, unless it hath been added by a later hand, as I have observed in some Manuscripts.

I shall not reckon Dr. *Burnet* in the number of those learned Critics, Dr. *Burnet*.
Letters
conc. his
Trav. into
Switzerl.
Italy, &c. that have applied themselves, with diligence, to search out ancient Manuscripts ; for altho he assures us, that he hath taken pains in his Travels to examin all the ancient MSS. of the New Testament that he could find, on the account of a Passage in the I. Epistle of St. *John*, Chap. 5. v. 7. Nevertheless having considered the manner of his discouraging concerning those Manuscripts, I am apt to believe that he hath only read them in Post-haste : He accuses the Transcribers for leaving this passage out of the Epistle of St. *John*, at least this is the judgment that he passes with respect to an ancient Manuscript of the Library of *Zurich*, in which he did not read these words ; *There are three that bear witness in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one.* But this (says this Learned Man) *was certainly the error or omission of the Copier.* If it be so, there are errors of the Copiers in a great number of MSS. Copies, in which this Verse is not found. This Doctor confirms his opinion by the Preface that is at the head of the Canonical Epistles, under the name of St. *Jerom* ; he demands *how it came to be omitted by Erasmus in his Edition of that Fathers Works,* and says, *that he can give no account thereof ;* but he acknowledges at the same time, *that his sincerity ought not to be too rashly censured.* On the other hand (adds Dr. *Burnet*) *that Preface being in all the Manuscripts Ancient or Modern, of those Bibles that have the other Prefaces in them that I ever yet saw, it is not easie to imagine what made Erasmus not to publish it ; and it is in the Manuscript Bibles at Basil, where he printed his Edition of St. Jerom's Works.* I would willingly know why he makes so many words to no purpose. *Erasmus* plainly discovers in his Notes on this passage of the Epistle of St. *John*, that he was persuaded that the Preface, which is before the Canonical Epistles, belongs to St. *Jerom*, since he concluded from thence, that this Father was the first that added this Verse now in dispute, to the *Latin* Edition, in which it was not before : But it hath been proved in the first part of this Work, that this Critic, and after him *Faustus Socinus*, have falsely accused St. *Jerom* of being the Author of this Addition, for want of considering that a Preface was read under his name, that was not written by him. This will yet appear more clearly in the sequel of this Discourse.

Dr. *Burnet* hath no better grounds to demand why *Erasmus* made no mention of this Preface in his Edition of St. *Jerom's* Works ; for to what purpose should he talk of a piece which he did not publish, because he found it not in his Manuscripts ? Moreover, why is he impeach-

Mar. Vi-
stor. ad
Pium IV.

ed rather than *Marianus Victorius*, who hath also neglected to insert it in his Edition of St. *Jerom's* Works? It is well known with what haste of passion this *Roman* Critic inveighed against *Erasmus*, whom he often charges with Ignorance and even with Impiety: He boasts that he hath restored in the printed Copies of the Writings of this Father about fifteen hundred places that were corrupted, and nevertheless he speaks not one word concerning this Preface, that gave him a very fair opportunity to treat his Adversary as an Heretic, if it had been in his Manuscripts: Upon the whole matter, it ought not to be sought for in St. *Jerom's* Works, where it never was, but in the Edition of his new Bible. Dr. *Burnet* hath taken notice of some MSS. Copies in which it is not found, and I could easily exhibit to him a much greater number. Moreover, the Doctor manifestly contradicts himself, when he asserts that it is in all the Manuscripts that he hath seen, and subjoins a little after, that he did not find in it a *Latin* Manuscript of the New Testament which he read at *Strasbourg*, and which seemed to him to be written an hundred years before the time of *Charles* the Great.

But not to insist any longer on these remarks of Dr. *Burnet*, who in his Works appears to be no very able Critic, it may be observed in general, that the afore mentioned Preface, and many others that are attributed to St. *Jerom*, are not in some Manuscripts of his Bible which are seven and eight hundred years old. These Manuscripts, altho they are not so numerous, ought to be preferred before the others, as being more pure and true; for the greatness of number proves nothing in the matter that is now under examination; since there are in this great quantity of MSS. other Prefaces ascribed to St. *Jerom*, that apparently do not appertain to the Works of this Father. It would be needless to produce here all the first Editions of the *Latin* Bibles, wherein Prefaces have been annexed before every Book of the New Testament, under the name of St. *Jerom*, that are not his; they are found in the most part of the Manuscripts since the time of *Charlemagne*, tho they do not always bear the name of this Father. I have read them in the Manuscript of St. *Germain des Prez*, that was transcribed under the Reign of *Lotharius II.* from a more ancient Copy; in which we see a Preface before the Gospel according to St. *Marc*, that begins with these words; *Marcus Evangelista Dei electus, & Petri in baptisate Filius, Mark the elect Evangelist of God, and the Son of Peter in baptism.* De *Lira*, who hath read it in his Bible, as belonging to St. *Jerom*, explains it in his Annotations, without making any difficulty thereupon. *Evangelio Marci* (saith he) *Beatus Hieronymus praeiungit Prologum istum.*

Nic. de
Lira in
Prol. Mar.

There is also in this same Manuscript of St. *Germain*, a Preface before St. *Luke's* Gospel under the title of an Argument, *Argumentum*, that begins thus, *Lucas Syrus natione Antiochensis arte Medicus, Luke a Syrian by Nation, a Physician of Antiochia.* There is another before the Gospel

Gospel of St. John, entituled a Prologue, beginning with these words ; *Hic est Joannes Evangelista unus ex Discipulis Dei*, This is John the Evangelist, one of the Disciples of God. The very same Prefaces are read in the Bibles of Charles the Bald, which are in the King's Library, and in that of Mr. Colbert. I have likewise found them in many other MSS. Bibles that are no less ancient ; but it is not convenient here to describe them in particular. It may be alledged as a proof of their being afterwards inserted in St. Jerom's Bible, that there are extant certain very ancient and exact Manuscripts thereof, in which we do not find them ; I have read one of this nature in the Library of St. Germain des Prez, that contains but part of the Old Testament with all the New, and is about eight hundred years old : We may judge of its exactness by these words added by the Copier at the end of the Book of Esther, *Finit Esther Deo gratias Amen. Huc usque completum est Vetus Testamentum, id est, omnes canonicas Scripturas, quod fient libri 24. quas transtulit Hieronymus Presbyter de Hebraica veritate in Latinum verti sermonem summo studio summaque cura per diversos codices oberrans editiones perquisivi in unum collexi corpus & scribens transfudi fecique pandecten. . . . Cetera vero Scripturae quae non sunt canonicae, sed dicuntur Ecclesiasticae istae sunt, id est, liber Judith, Tobias, libri Maccabaorum duo, Sapientia quae dicitur Salomonis & liber Hiesu filii Sirach & liber Pastoris.* The Solecisms of this Copier ought not to be regarded, because no care was taken in those times to be exact in the Latin Tongue. We shall only insist on what he says, that he hath applied himself with much diligence to search out the most correct Copies of St. Jerom's Bible ; he gives us a mark of his exactness, in distinguishing according to the method of this Father in his Prefaces, the xxiv. Books that were translated out of the Hebrew, from the others which he esteemed as Apocryphal with relation to the Canon of the Jews.

Moreover we read in the same Manuscript, these other words at the end of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the New Testament ends according to the ancient Order of the Latin Bibles. *Bibliotheca Hieronymi Presbyteri Bethlehem secundum Græcum ex emendatissimis libris conlatus.* This not only shews the accurateness of the Transcriber, but the common opinion of those times, which was, that St. Jerom had revised the whole New Testament by the Greek Copies. No mention was then made of the ancient Version called the *Italic* ; for the Copiers transcribed no other Latin Bible, but that of St. Jerom's Edition, therefore they usually intimated as much in the end of their Books. But that which deserves our further observation in this excellent Manuscript of St. Germain des Prez is, that we do not find therein this great number of Prefaces that are in the most part of the other Manuscripts before every Book of the New Testament. We read only at the beginning of the Gospels, the Epistle of St. Jerom to Pope Damasus, after that the Canons of Eusebius, and an Index of the Chapters or

Contents of every Gospel, these four Verses are also prefixed to that of St. *Matthew*,

*Mattheus instituit virtutum tramite mores,
Et bene vivendi justo dedit ordine leges.
Marcus fremit ore Leo, similisque videnti
Intonat aterna pandens mysteria vita.*

*St. Matthew points to Vertue's pleasant ways,
And to the World, most righteous Laws displays
Of Endless Life : St. Mark proclaims the day,
As the fierce Lion roars for distant prey.*

There is no other Preface but these four Verses at the beginning of St. *Mark's* Gospel, and at the end these words are read, *Evangelium secundum Marcum explicit, incipit secundum Lucam* ; here ends the Gospel according to Mark, and that according to Luke begins ; and afterwards these two Verses that supply the place of a Preface to St. *Luke's* Gospel :

*Lucas uberius describit praelia Christi
Jure sacer vitulus quia vatum munia fatur.*

*Like as the sacred Ox by th' Altar kneels,
Celestial Mysteries St. Luke reveals.*

We read also at the end of this Gospel, *Explicit Evangelium secundum Lucam, incipit secundum Johannem* ; here ends the Gospel according to Luke, and that according to John begins. And afterwards these two Verses.

*Johannes amat terras inter cælumque volare,
Et vehemens aquila stricto secatur omnia lapsu.*

*St. John delights 'twixt Heav'n and Earth to fly,
And as an Eagle cuts the liquid Sky.*

All the other Copies of St. *Jerom's* Latin Bible ought to be regulated by this Manuscript, which is pure and exact ; and it would be requisite in imitation of Robert Stephen in his Editions, to reject all the Prefaces that do not belong to this Father. It plainly appears, that these Verses are not his, and that that they are added only instead of a Summary before every Gospel : The Transcriber of this ancient Bible hath punctually followed the best Copies, without inserting any thing that was not written by St. *Jerom*, under the Title of Preface, Prologue, or Argument ; and it is for this reason that we do not find therein the
other

other Prefaces which are in the greater part of the MSS. even of the most ancient before the Acts of the Apostles, the Canonical Epistles, and those of St. Paul; he hath contented himself to annex these words to the end of St. John's, Gospel: *Evangelium secundum Johannem explicit in nomine Domini Dei Nostri Jesu Christi, Here endeth the Gospel according to John in the name of our Lord God Jesus Christ.* Afterwards he passes to the Acts of the Apostles, omitting the Preface that is read in many Manuscripts; and only subjoins these words as it were in the nature of verses, in which he recommends himself to the prayers of the Readers, *Quicumque legis obsecro rogo dicas pax tibi scribtor. Orare non pigeat, pigent per ipsum te peto omnipotentem. Et memor esto venturus Dominus facturum judicia cunctis. Promissas restituet Apostolorum ordine sedes.* From thence he comes immediately to the Acts, the Canonical Epistles, and the Revelation without any other Preface but this Title: *Hæc insunt Actus Apostolorum & Epistula Canonica. Jacobi I. Petri II. Johannis III. Jude. I Apocalypsis Johannis, Here are contained the Acts of the Apostles and the Canonical Epistles. I of James. II. of Peter. III of John. I of Jude, and the Revelation of John.* He adds only at the beginning of the Acts, the Index of the Chapters or Contents, as it is observed in all the MSS. Books whether Greek or Latin, that are written with any exactness.

We do not find in the same Manuscript before the Canonical Epistles, this famous Preface that hath caused so great a number of Divines and Critics to run into an error, who have too easily believ'd without examining the ancient Manuscripts, that it was written by St. Jerom; these words are only read at the end of the Acts: *Explic. Actus Apostolorum, incipit Epistula Jacobi: Here end the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle of St. James begins.* If father Mavillon had cast an Eye on this excellent Manuscript which is in the Library of his Monastery, he would not have been surprized to see some ancient Latin Copies of the Canonical Epistles, where St. Jerom complains in a Preface that is prefixed to them, that a passage in the I. Epistle of St. John hath been struck out, which nevertheless is not read in the Text of the very same Copies. *Epistolis Canonicis* (saith this learned Monk, speaking concerning an ancient MS. that he had seen at Rome) *præfigitur absque auctoris nomine Hieronymi Prologus conquerentis quod in prima Johannis Epistola testimonium de unitate Trinitatis ab infidelibus translatoribus sit prætermisum; & tamen in ipsius Epistola contextu, quod mirere, hoc testimonium omittitur.* The common opinion that attributes this Epistle or Preface to St. Jerom, is hereby anticipated. Indeed, if it were his, it would be ridiculous that this Father should exclaim so much as he doth, against the ancient Interpreters of the Epistle of St. John, for taking away from their Copies a passage of such importance, and notwithstanding this accusation that it should not be found in his Edition: This alone is enough to give a just suspicion that the Preface doth not

P. Ma-
bill. Mus.
Ital p. 67.

not belong to St. Jerom, there being a very considerable number of good *Latin* Manuscripts in which this passage is not read, although the Preface is contained therein; for besides those that have been described in the first part of this History, I could produce several other, that are both ancient and written by a good hand; but those that I have above exhibited are more than sufficient to prove, that the Epistle which was believed even to this present time to be St. Jerom's, is by no means his, and that this Father never added in his Edition of the New Testament the 7th. verse of the 5th. Chapter of the I. Epistle of St. John, which is now read in all the *Latin* Copies.

Zeger.
Castig. in
N. Test.
ad Epist.
I. Joann.
c. 5. v. 7.

Zegerus, who hath thereupon consulted many Manuscript Copies and the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, freely confesses that there is only St. Jerom's Preface and a long Custom of the Church of Rome to prove that these words, *For there are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one*, do certainly appertain to the Epistle of St. John *Hunc locum* (saith this Critic) *hactenus apud nullum reperi veterum per omnia consentientem cum lectione nostra, ut ex sola Hieronymi in hac Epistolâ Prefatione probari possit, interpretis excepta auctoritate, & longo Ecclesiæ Romanæ usu, hanc vulgatam lectionem esse Apostoli germanam.* He declares as a very strange thing (a) that this Father hath observed that this passage was not in the *Latin* Edition of his time, but that it was found in the *Greek* Copies; whereas at this day it is in all the *Latin* Copies, and on the contrary it is not read in the *Greek*, unless in those that are altogether new. I would desire no other reflexion but this, to make it appear that St. Jerom is not the Author of a Preface that bears his name at the beginning of the Canonical Epistles, and which cannot be ascribed to any but to some person that did not examin the *Greek* Copies that were extant in his time.

Luc. Brug.
Not. in
Epist. I.
Joann. c.
5.

Since we are come to the *Greek* Manuscripts, it will not be amiss to make this remark, that there is an apparent fault in the Printing of this place in the fair *Greek* Edition of the New Testament of Robert Stephen; the Semi-circle or Hook that shews how it should be read, is placed after *ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ*, whereas it ought to be put immediately before *ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ*, inasmuch that all these words, *ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ λόγος καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ οἱ τοιοῦτοι τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες*, were not in the seven Copies that are quoted in the Margent of this Edition. Lucas Brugensis (b) hath already made this conjecture; for he durst

(a) Queritur autem Hieronymus in Latinis defuisse codicibus, quod tum haberetur in Græcis, nempe Patris Verbiq; ac Spiritus testimonium, cum idem contra hodie habeatur in Latinis, non autem similiter in Græcis, nisi tantum in recens recognitis. Zeg. Castig. in N. T. Epist. I. Joann. c. 5. v. 7.

(b) Inter omnes Parisiensem Græcos codices ne unus est qui dissideat, nisi quod septem duntaxat τδ in cælo confodiant, si tamen semicirculus lectionis designans terminum suo loco sit collocatus. Luc. Brug. Not. in Epist. I. Joann. c. 5.

not avouch that this Verse is intire in all *R. Stephen's Greek Manuscripts* without the words *ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*: therefore having observed this, he subjoins, *Nevertheless if the Semi-circle that denotes the end of the reading be put in its proper place.* Indeed it is difficult to find *Greek Mss.* in which these words are expressed; they are not found in any of those of the *Kings Library* that I have consulted.

To return to the *Latin Manuscripts*: *Beda*, who lived in the VIII. Century, had not in his Edition the Preface that is before the Canonical Epistles, nor the passage of *St. Johns Epistle*, wherein mention is made of the Testimony of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. He hath written an exact Commentary on this Epistle, in which he explains at large the Testimony of the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood in Earth, without speaking so much as one word concerning the other that relates to the three persons of the Trinity. The Author of a Critical Work called *Correctorium Biblia* hath not proceeded after the same manner, for he observes in his Notes on these words, *tres sunt qui testimonium dant in Cælo*, there are three that bear record in Heaven, that according to the opinion of *St. Jerom*, some *Greek Copies* that had not this Verse, were corrupted. *Hic corrupti sunt* (saith he) *quidem Libri Græcorum, ut ait B. Hieronymus, qui hoc capitulum non habent in quo maxime fides Catholica roboratur.* But it doth not appear that this Critic understood the words of the pretended *St. Jerom*, who imputed not this corruption to the *Greek Copies*, but to the *Latin Interpreters*, that had not inserted in their Translation what they found in the Original Text.

It will be convenient here to produce the very words of this counterfeit *St. Jerom*, who complains of those that had changed the Order of these Epistles, and had moreover suppressed a passage of the I. Epistle of *St. John*, by which the Unity of the substance of the three Persons of the Trinity is effectually confirmed. *Quæ Epistola* (saith this Author) *si sicut ab eis digesta sunt, ita quoque ab interpretibus fideliter in Latinum verterentur eloquium, nec ambiguitatem legentibus facerent, nec sermonum sese varietates impugnarent, illo præcipue loco ubi de Unitate Trinitatis in prima Joannis Epistola positum legimus. In qua etiam ab infidelibus translatoribus multum erratum esse a fidei veritate comperimus, trium tantummodo vocabula, hoc est, aquæ, sanguinis & Spiritus, in ipsa editione ponentibus, & Patris Verbiq; ac Spiritus testimonium omittentibus, in quo maxime & fides Catholica roboratur, & Patris ac Filii & Spiritus Sancti una Divinitatis substantia corroboratur.* It evidently appears from hence, that he that composed this Epistle, accuses only the ancient *Latin Interpreters*, and not the *Greek Copies*. As for the Author of the *Correctorium* of *Sorbonne*, it is no wonder that he hath read it in his *Latin Edition* together with the controverted passage, in regard that he could not have compiled his Work till the X. Century: Now it is certain that at that time there were very few *Latin Copies* of the New Testament in which the Preface and this passage was not found, in

as much as they were inserted therein ever since the time of *Charles* the Great.

Whosoever were the Authors of this Edition in the I. Epistle of *St. John*, Chap. 5. they could not hinder the Copiers that transcribed the *Latin* Bibles, from other Copies under the Reigns of the Successors of this Prince, and especially under that of *Charles* the Bald, from leaving out this passage that hath respect to the three Persons of the Trinity, tho they prefixed the Preface that makes mention thereof, before the Canonical Epistles. Seeing their whole faculty consisted in copying out the ancient Books, they made no reflection on the manifest contrariety that there was betwixt the Text of their Copies, and this Preface : But when these Books passed through the Hands of the Revisers they inserted this passage therein to suit the Text of *St. John's* Epistle with the aforesaid Preface ; and this hath caused the great diversity that appears in this place in the Manuscript Copies. Those Copies that have not been corrected by the Revisers, such are the Bibles of *Charles* the Bald, that remain in the King's Library and in that of Mr. *Colbert*, and another Manuscript of the Library of *St. Martins des Champs* that contains but part of the New Testament, and is of the same date, have not the Verse in which mention is made of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost : The others on the contrary that were revised by the Censors retain it in form of an addition. We ought not to be surprized to see this addition in some Manuscripts written with the same Hand as the Text, because (as hath been already observed) there were Revisers in the Monasteries, that corrected the Books, or caused them to be corrected as soon as they were transcribed : But if there were then no Monks that were capable of revising and correcting them, they were left till such persons could be found as were qualified for this employment ; wherefore the additions are not always written by the same Hand, nor at the same time.

Cod. Bibl.
MS. ex.
Bibl.
Colb. n.
156.

As for example, in an ancient Manuscript that is in Mr. *Colbert's* Library, the Preface that is now in dispute is read simply under the Title of *Prologus, a Prologus* ; but the Reviser hath afterwards added these words *B. Hieronymi Presbyteri, of St. Jerom Priest*, to shew the Author this addition is of a different and later writing than that of the Text : The place is also altered in this Manuscript, wherein the passage of the Epistle of *St. John* ought to be found ; since the Transcriber omitted it in his Copy, the Reviser hath annexed it thereto. This Correction is the original of the Uniformity that occurs in this place in the Mss. that are not above 600 years old, it being a hard matter to meet with any dated since that time which have not this passage, because they were for the most part transcribed from Copies that had been revised : Nevertheless there is one in the Kings Library written not very long ago, in which it is not read, and no alteration hath been made therein ; there can be no other reason alledged but this, that it was Copied out from

Cod. MS.
ex. Bibl.
Reg. n.
1563.

from a Manuscript that escaped the correction of the Revisers. However it might be observed, that altho almost all the Mss. that are not above 600 years old agree in retaining this passage, they differ nevertheless not only in the order of placing, but also in the manner of reading it; for whereas the Verse wherein an account is given of the Testimony of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, in our Vulgar preceeds that which expresses that of the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood; this last on the contrary in many Manuscripts is written before the other: I shall not spend time in describing these Mss. in particular, because it would be too tedious, if not offensive.

As for the expressions, it is read in some *testimonium dant*, and others, *testimonium dicunt*. Moreover, we do not find in some at the end of vers. 8. that contains the Testimony of the Spirit, the Water and the Blood these words, & *hi tres unum sunt*, and these three are one. This diversity can be attributed to none but the Revisers, who having differed in their correction, the Copiers followed these variations. There are some of these Mss. in the Kings Library in which these words are not written in vers. 8. & *hi tres unum sunt*. I have seen also two Mss. of the like nature containing the Canonical Epistles with the ordinary Gloss, in the Library of St. Germain des Prez, one of which formerly belonged to Peter Bishop of Poitiers: For we read in the beginning; *Epistola Canonica de libris Magistri Petri Pictaviensis quas dedit sancto Germano de Pratis*. Cardinal Ximenes in his Bible of Alcala, or *Biblia Complutensis*, hath followed the reading of these Latin Copies, as the most exact; he hath likewise inserted a Note on this place to vindicate it, which he hath taken from the Writings of St. Thomas (c) who pre-

Cod. MSS.
ex Bibl. S.
Germ. nn.
43, & 44.

Bibl.
Complut.
not. in
Epist. I.
Joann. c. 5.

tended that these words, & *hi tres unum sunt*, & these three are one, were added on purpose by the Arians, to corrupt the sense of this passage: But there is no appearance of truth in this assertion. Moreover, the Censors of Rome, who revised the Vulgar, have not regarded it, altho the Divines of Louvain had exhibited in the Margent of their Edition fifteen Copies, in which they were not found.

Before I finish this Chapter, it will not be amiss in few words to give an account of these Critical Books, called *Correctoria Biblie*, that may be ranked in the number of Manuscripts, and are of very great

(c) Thomas in expositione secundæ Decretalis de summa Trinitate & fide Catholica tractans, ipsum passum contra Abbatem Joachim, tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cælo, Pater, Verbum & Spiritus Sanctus, dicit ad literam verba sequentia, & ad insinuandam unitatem trium personarum subditur, & *hi tres unum sunt*: quod quidem dicitur propter essentia unitatem. Sed hoc Joachim perverse trahere volens ad unitatem charitatis & consensus inducebat consequentem auctoritatem. Nam subditur ibidem, & *tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua, & sanguis*, & in quibusdam libris additur, & *hi tres unum sunt*. Sed hoc in veris exemplaribus non habetur, sed dicitur esse appositum ab hæreticis Ariani ad pervertendum intellectum sanum auctoritatis præmissæ de unitate essentia trium personarum. Hæc E. Thomas ubi supra. Card. Xim. Not. in Epist. I. Joann. c. 5.

use in judging of the true readings of the *Latin Bibles* : That of *Sorbonne* concerning which I have elsewhere discoursed, relates as well to the New Testament as to the old. A certain Copy of the whole Bible written at *Paris* with much care, is sometimes cited therein under the name of *Parisius*, at least this *Parisius* that is often mentioned under the Title of *Correctio Parisiensis*, may be one of these Critical Books termed *Correctoria Biblia*, or rather a Copy to which Critical Remarks had been annexed : This seems to me to be most probable ; For in the second *Correctorium* of *Sorbonne*, where these words are read Epist. I. Cor. Chap. 3. v. 21. *Nemo gloriatur in hominibus*, Let no Man glory in Men, we find this Observation (d) the Copy of Paris adds, *sed in Christo Jesu Domino nostro*, but in Christ Jesus our Lord ; but nothing of this is expressed in the Margent. *Lucas Brugensis* in his Critical Annotations on the Bible, sometimes cites a Manuscript that was transcribed in France by the *Dominican Friars* from a Copy of *Charles the Great*. Furthermore mention is made of this ancient Manuscript called *Parisius*, and *Correctio Parisiensis* in the Correction of *Sorbonne* on *Matth. Chap. 23. v. 14*. We read in this place in the present Vulgar : *Va vobis Scribae & Pharisei Hypocrite, quia comeditis Domos viduarum orationes longas orantes; propter hoc amplius accipietis judicium*. Wo unto you Scribes & Pharisees Hypocrites, for ye devour Widows Houses, making long prayers ; therefore ye shall receive greater damnation. It is expressly declared in the said *Sorbonne Correction*, that this verse is not in the Copy that was corrected at *Paris*, *Secundum Correctionem Parisiensem vacat iste versus usque in judicium*. Besides it is intimated therein, (e) that it is not in the Greek Text, in the Edition of *St. Jerom*, nor in the Works of the Ancients ; that it is read only read in *St. Mark, Chap. 12. v. 40.* and in *St. Luke, Chap. 20. v. 47.* But that *St. Chrysostom* on the contrary, who was a *Grecian*, expounds it in this place ; as also doth *St. Hilary*, who is of great Authority and antiquity, in his Commentary, where he explains all the words of *St. Matthew*. It is no wonder (say they) that *St. Jerom*, whose Commentary is not continued on all the words of *St. Matthew*, hath not explained it. Hence it appears that the Compiler of this Critical Work, thought it to be more expedient to retain this verse in the Text of *St. Matthew*, than to take it away ; because *St. Hilary* read it in his Copy. The Censors of Rome have taken his part, altho *Hentenius* produces eight Copies in the Margent of his Edition, wherein he did not find it ; and it was not read in ten, according to the Testimony of the Divines of *Louvain*.

(d) *Parisius statim post hoc addit, sed in Christo Jesu domino nostro ; sed nihil de hoc taigitur in margine. Corrector. Sorb. MS. in N. T.*

(e) *Gr. Jer. an non habent istum versum sed est M. XII. & Luc. XX. tantum modo, sed contra Chrysostomus qui fuit Græcus istud exponit hic, & Hilarius qui exponit Marbaüm continue magne auctoritatis & antiquitatis. Nec mirum si Jer. non exponit qui continue non exponit. Correct. Sorb. MS. in N. T.*

Zegerus assures us that he had it not in his most ancient & exact *Latin* Copies, some of which he names, and describes one wherein it was added in the Margent; he says moreover that no mention is made thereof in an ancient Commentary that bears the name of *Beda*; indeed this verse is not expounded in the printed Commentaries of this Author, tho he makes reflections on all those that in this place relate to the Scribes and Pharisees. These reasons induced *Lucas Brugensis* to declare that it appeared to him to be taken from the other Evangelists, from whence it was inserted in the Gospel of St. *Matthem*, not without some alteration to adjust it to the sequel of the discourse: *Videri ex his simul omnibus possit adjectitiue esse hic versus, atque ex aliis Evangeliiis huc assumptus nonnulla facta mutatione, ut aliis hujus capituli in Scribas & Phariseos comminationibus esset per similis.* This Critical Note confirms the Correction of *Paris*, that seems to be exact in this particular: The Collectour of the *Sorbonne Correction* apparently had a *Greek* Copy like unto that of *Cambridge*, in which this Verse is not found, or rather he hath taken his remark from some ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, who read it not in their *Greek* Copies, altho it is in those that are extant at this day. The *Latin* MSS. that have it not, and that agree in this with the *Cambridge* Copy, with St. *Jerom* and with *Beda*, appear in this place to be more correct than the *Greek*.

It may be observed that the Manuscript of *Sorbonne* contains two Works under the title of *Correctorium*, as well on the Old as on the New Testament: The second nevertheless is only as it were the supplement of the first: This causes me to believe that these kinds of Books that are at present very scarce, were then common; indeed other *Corrections* are quoted in them under the Titles of, *Prima & secunda Correctio*, *Utraque Correctio*. These Writings were consulted in revising the *Latin* Bibles, as the *Jews* made use of their *Masora* to correct the *Hebrew* Copies; and an enquiry is made therein according to the most strict rules of the Critical Art, what is convenient to be preserved in the Text, and what ought to be rejected, and it is on this account that we often meet with these expressions: This reading belongs to the Text, That doth not. In a word, that which is true is distinguished with a great deal of liberty, from that which seems to be false. *Est de textu, non est de textu; vera est litera, falsa est litera.* Moreover all these abbreviations are marked in the *Correction* of *Sorbonne an. mo. Gre.* the ancient and the modern readings, and the *Greek* Text. The Fathers are also cited to illustrate the most obscure passages; and 'tis for this reason that we often read therein, the names of *Origen*, *Hilary*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Chrysostom*, *St. Agustin*, *Beda*, *Rabanus*, *Haimo*, *Isidorus* and some other Ecclesiastical Writers; but that of St. *Jerom* occurs more frequently than any other: It is observed, for example, in the *second Correction* of *Sorbonne* on the 12. Chap. of the Epistle to the *Romans*, vers. 3. (f) that St. *Jerom* affirmed in his Book against *Jovinian* that it ought

(f) *For. contra Jovin. quod hic non debet dici sapere ad sobrietatem, ut male in Latinis codicibus legitur, sed sapere, inquit, ad pudicitiam, II. Correct. Sorb. in N T.*

not to be read in this place as it is in the *Latin Copies*, *sapere ad sobrietatem*, think to sobriety: but *ad pudicitiam*, to Chastity. Besides, the Copy that was corrected at *Paris*, and the other Corrections, other readings are sometimes cited in general, under this abbreviation *al*.

There is nothing so frequent in Books of this nature as the word *correctio* or Critical remark; the least particles of the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues are examined therein, and there are also certain passages corrected from the Original *Greek* without the assistance of any *Latin* Copy. Thus in *Chap. 2. of St. Luke*, vers. 2. where we yet read in our *Vulgar* at this day, *Hæc descriptio prima facta est a Praside Syria Cyrino*, This enrolling was first made by *Cyrinus* Governor of *Syria*; it is observed that the preposition *a*, by, is not in the *Greek*, which ought to be preferred (say they) in this place before the *Latin*: *Græca litera non habet a & planior hic & verior est*. *Hentenius* and the *Louvain* Divines have taken no notice of any diversity of reading in this passage; it is probable that they read the Preposition *a* in all their *Latin* Copies. *Zegerus* and *Lucas Brugensis* are silent as to this particular, in their Critical Annotations on the New Testament; but *Maldonat* the Jesuit makes no difficulty to blot it out of the Text in his Commentary on this place, tho the Censors of *Rome* have retained it; and freely declares that it ought to be read, *Hæc descriptio prima facta est Praside Cyrino*, This enrolling was first made when *Cyrinus* was Governor.

Lucas Brugensis hath also had one of these Books, entituled *Correctoria Biblia*, in his possession, and often makes application to it in his Notes; he much commends the great exactness of this Manuscript, and discourages thereof after such a manner as makes it appear that the *Latin* Church wanted not good Critics on the *H. Scriptures*, *Præter alia*, (says this learned Man) *id quod maxime facimus manuscriptum Bibliorum Correctorium ab incerto auctore, quem Epanorthotem aut Correctorem fere vocamus, magna diligentia ac fide contextum, secuto, uti oportet antiquos nostræ Editionis codices, eosque cum Hebræis, Græcis & veterum Patrum Commentariis sedulo collocatos*. He corrects without any scruple upon the observation of this Critic, a fault that is still found at present in our *Vulgar* in the 8th. Chapter of *Genesis*, vers. 7. where we read *qui egrediebatur & non revertebatur*, which went forth and returned not; whereas it ought to be read without the negative particle, *& revertebatur*, and returned. This Corrector avouches that the word *non*, not, is not in the *Hebrew*, nor in the ancient *Latin* Copies, tho it is in the *Greek* Version of the *LXX* Interpreters: We must follow (saith he) in this place the *Hebrew* Text, the Ancients and *St. Jerom.* *Sed sequendi sunt Hebræi & antiqui & Hieronymus*. But forasmuch as it might be affirmed that this Corrector was of the number of those that believe that the *Latin* Copies ought to be reformed by the *Hebrew*, *Lucas Brugensis* prevents this objection, shewing that the Corrector whom he mentions, judged on the contrary, that the *Hebrew* was corrupted, and therefore that the *Latin* Version should not be corrected by this Text. Ne-

Id Corr.
Sorb.

Mald.
Comm. in
c. 2. Luc.

Luc.
Brug.
Catal.
Libb.
Scrip. qui
præmitt.
suis Not.

Correct.
Bibl. apud
Luc. Brug.
Not. in c.
3. Gen. v. 7.

Luc.
Brug. not.
in c. 8.
Gen. v. 7.

que dici potest ejus libri auctorem ex iis esse qui ad Hebraeos Codices Latinos mutare student. Non semel enim Hebraeos sui temporis corruptos asserit, & sequendos Latinos antiquos docet, eosque qui ad Hebraea Latina mutarunt exemplaria arguit. This learned Man protests that he hath found in this Work almost all the various readings that the Writers of our time have collected out of divers MSS. Books, and that they are therein faithfully examined by the Originals. *Qua namque* (saith he) *a nostri* Luc. seculi Scriptoribus ex MSS. codicibus collecta sunt varia lectiones omnes pro- Brug. modum in eo comperimus, & ad fontes fideliter examinatas deprehen- ibid. dimus.

Mariana (g) confirms the opinion of *Lucas Brugensis* relating to the 7. Verse of the 8. Chapter of *Genesis*, and relies in this particular on the credit of a *Latin Bible*, to which he ascribes the age of 600 years, wherein the Negative particle was not inserted. Cardinal *Ximenes* hath followed this reading in his Edition of *Ascala*, from whence it passed afterwards into the Bible of *Philipp II.* This learned Jesuit hath also propounded this Critical rule on occasion of the aforesaid passage in the Book of *Genesis*, that when there happens a variety in the *Latin Copies*, we must prefer the reading that is most conformable to the Originals, and that then greater respect ought to be had to these Originals than to the plurality of the *Latin Copies*, *Ubi* (saith he) *varia* Mar. ibid. *rint Latini codices, ea est praferenda lectio qua magis cum Prototypo & fon-* c. 24. *tibus convenit, etiamsi diversa lectio in pluribus codicibus extet; atque adeo* *Gen. 8. v. 7. Dimisit corvum qui egrediebatur & revertebatur, ut est* *in Bibliis Gothicis & Complutensibus, verior lectio haberi debet.*

These Correctors or Critics were not unknown to *Zegerus*, who hath cited some of them in his Critical Enquiries concerning the various readings of the New Testament: He avers, being supported by their Authority, that these words of the 27. Chapter of *St. Matthew* vers. 35. *ut impleretur quod dictum est per Prophetam dicentem, Diviserunt sibi vestimenta mea, & super vestem meam miserunt sortem*, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet saying; they parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots, are not found in the ancient *Latin Copies*; he considers them as a Gloss that hath been added to the Text. *Totum illud* (saith he) *quod interponitur, ut impleretur quod* Nic. Zeg. *dictum est, usque ad sortem, quoniam priscis illis scriptoribus hic lectum non* Castig. in *est, & correctoria quaedam indicant id in antiquis exemplaribus adscriptum* N. T. *non fuisse, atque apud solum Joannem haberi, palam sit adjectitium esse, &* Matth. *extra germanum contextum habendum.* c. 27. But the Censors of Rome have thought fit to keep them in our Vulgar. The same *Zegerus* examining the 22. vers. of the 21. Chapter of the Gospel according to *St.*

(g) Hoc certe loco Editionem nostram ab antiquo esse immutatam, addita ex Septuaginta Interpretibus negatione Gothicum exemplar ante 600. annos descriptum detracta negatione ex verbis habens, quod *Biblia Complutensium* linguarum & Regia secuta sunt. Joann. Marian. pro Edit. Vulg. c. 18.

Zeg.
Castig. in
N. T. ad
c. 21.
Joann.
vers. 22.

Mar. Vic.
apud Luc.
Brug. Not.
in c. 21.
Joann.

John, where we read at present in the Vulgar, *sic eum volo manere*, so I will that he tarry, reforms this passage by an ancient *Correctorium* in which are cited the *Greek Copies* and the old *Latin Bibles* that had *si sic*, if so, and not simply *sic*. *Nacti quoque* (says this Critic) *tandem sumus vetustum quoddam Correctorium, quod testatur olim tam in Graecis quam in antiquis Latinis, si sic, scriptum fuisse*. It is probable that the Corrector consulted in that place some of those ancient *Greek Copies* to which the *Italick* was conformable; for this reading is not found in any *Greek Manuscript*, but that of *Cambridge*, and in another of the *Marquess de Velez*; to which may be added a third Manuscript being very ancient, which the Bishop of *Clermont* brought to the Council of *Trent* in the year 1546. as *Marianus Victorius* has remarked, wherein it was read after the same manner as in that of *Cambridge*.

It is matter of wonder that these Critical Books which were composed by *Latin Writers* in a time when *Barbarism* was predominant in *Europe*, should become so scarce that they have been seen but by very few persons; it is difficult to find any of them at this day in the best Libraries: This can be attributed (as I take it) to nothing but *Scholastick Divinity* that appeared in the World a little after, which was the cause that the study of the Art of Critic was absolutely neglected, as seeming to be grounded only on Grammatical nicities, to adhere to the subtilties of the School; and since the People did not understand *Greek* and *Hebrew*, they took no pleasure in reading Books that were written for the most part in those Languages: not that they that made these collections were expert in them; but they had read the Works of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers; especially these of *St. Jerom* as to the *Hebrew*, and the Writings of the *Greek Fathers*, the greatest part of which were translated into *Latin*: Moreover they consulted the ancient Copies of the *Latin Bible*, as also the Books that were set apart for Ecclesiastical uses, and by them they regulated the readings that ought to be admitted into the Text of their Bibles. They likewise made Catalogues of certain faults in the Writing that were in the Vulgar Editions, that the Copiers might correct them: But it seems no great regard hath been had thereto, for part of these errors are found in the first Bibles that were Printed. There is a long Catalogue under different Titles, at the end of the Correction of *Sorbonne*. Moreover all the Books of the Bible have been perused in particular with so great exactness, that the very *Solecisms* are corrected, and the long and short quantities of the syllables are marked therein, from whence any equivocal ambiguity may arise as to the sense of some words.

C H A P. X.

Of the order of the Latin Bibles of St Jerom in the MS. Copies ; and of their division into different Sections.

IT seems that before the time of St. Jerom there was no distinction of Sections in the *Latin Bibles*, he being the first (as he declares himself) that began to divide them into certain portions or members, in imitation of what was practised by Grammarians in profane Authors ; he contrived this division of the Bible (as *Cassiodorus* observes it) into many Sections to render the reading of it more easy : *Meminisse autem debemus Hieronymum omnem translationem suam in auctoritate divina, sicut ipse testatur, propter simplicitatem fratrum colis & commatibus ordinasse, ut qui distinctiones secularium literarum comprehendere minime potuerunt, hoc remedio suffulti inculpabiliter pronunciarent sacras literas.* Indeed all these distinctions are to be seen in the most ancient *Latin Manuscripts* that we have of St. Jerom's Bible ; whereas the *Latin Editions* of the New Testament used before his Time in the Churches, were written in one continued series or order, without any distinction, as appears from the two MS. Copies of the Epistles of St. Paul, one of which is in the King's Library, and the other in that of St. Germain des Prez ; for altho these Manuscripts are not above a thousand years old, nevertheless they were transcribed from others of a more ancient date.

As for the Old Testament we have no Manuscript Copy of the ancient Edition extant at this day, as it hath been above observed. *Cassiodorus* himself only placed it in his Library after the same manner as it had been revised by St. Jerom, that is to say, with the Asterisks and Obelisks which he had inserted therein, to make it more conformable to the *Hebrew Text*. The *Latins* have had so great an esteem for this Father, that for a thousand years they have made use of no other, but his Version ; and the most exact Transcribers have intirely followed, as to the Order of the Books, the method prescribed by him in his Prefaces, where speaking according to the Canon of the *Jews*, he reckons in the number of Divine and Canonical Books, only those that he had translated out of the *Hebrew* into *Latin*. There are yet remaining in our Vulgar, since it hath been reformed by the Censors of Rome, some marks of this distinction ; the Rubric for example, is preserved that is found in the Manuscripts on the six last Chapters of *Esther*, which are only in the *Greek* : St. Jerom had distinguished them with a point or Obelisk, to shew that they were not in the Original of the *Jews*, but that they were taken from the ancient Vulgar that was then read in all the Western Churches : this drew upon him great reproaches, especially from his Adversaries : *Ruffinus* objected to him, that he Judaized, ascribing more authority to the Copies that were read in the

Syna-

Cod. MS.
Bibl. S.
Germ. n.
34.

Synagogues, than to those that were generally received throughout all the Churches in the World. But notwithstanding this accusation that perhaps deserved some reflection, St. *Jerom's* Edition, by little and little, gained the upper hand : Many Transcribers separately copied out that which was not in the Original *Hebrew* ; therefore we do not find in some *Latin* Copies the six or seven Chapters of *Esther* that are only in the *Greek*, joined to the rest of the Volume. There is a Manuscript in the Library of St. *Germain des Prez* that contains *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Esther* and *Ruth* with the Gloss ; the Book of *Esther* ends in this Copy at Chap. 10. Vers. 3. and after the word *pertinerent*, the same observation is read as in our Vulgar, viz. *qua habentur in Hebraeo*, &c. But the other Chapters that are not in the *Hebrew*, are left out ; as if St. *Jerom* had believed, that they ought to be taken away from thence and put in another place. The Author of the *Correction* of *Sorbonne* hath also remarked on the Book of *Esther*, that it ended after the 9th Chapter, and that the others were not in his Copy.

Aug. lib. 2.
de Doctr.
Christ. c. 8.

To come to the Books of the New Testament, they are ranked after this manner in the most ancient Manuscripts of St. *Jerom's* Bible ; the Acts of the Apostles immediately follow after the Gospels, and after the Acts come the Canonical Epistles, the first of which is that of St. *James*, and the others afterwards in the same Order as they are in our Vulgar : the fourteen Epistles of St. *Paul* with the Revelation compose the last part : Insomuch that the New Testament is, as it were, divided into three parts, the first whereof contains the Gospels alone ; the Second, the Acts and the Canonical Epistles, and the Third, the Epistles of St. *Paul*, together with the Revelation. St. *Augustin* hath made use of another method in his Books of the Christian Doctrin ; for he places the Epistles of St. *Paul* after the Gospels, and the Canonical Epistles before the Acts of the Apostles, to which he subjoins the Revelation ; he makes also another rank in the order of the Canonical Epistles, putting the two of St. *Peter* at the head, and that of St. *James* last of all : These Books must needs be disposed after this manner in his time, at least in his Church : But the Order that is observed in the most ancient Bibles of St. *Jerom*, is more conformable to the *Greek* Manuscripts ; which hath been also followed by the Church of *Rome* in those MSS. that were written for her use about eight hundred years ago. I have seen one of this sort in the King's Library, that is very fair, and is of the number of those in which the Preface is not annexed at the beginning of the Canonical Epistles.

Cod. MS.
Bibl. Reg.
n. 3564.

Cassiod.
Divin.
Lect. c. 8.

Cassiodorus, who hath also divided the Books of the New Testament into three Parts, agrees better with St. *Augustin* than with St. *Jerom's* Edition ; for he joins together in the Second Part, all the Epistles which he calls the Canonical Epistles of the Apostles, giving this name equally to those of St. *Paul*, and to the others that are ordinarily termed Canonical or Catholic. *Octavus Codex*, (says he) *Canonicas*

nica Epistolae continet Apostolorum, the Third Part consists of the Acts of the Apostles and the Revelation. *Nonus Codex Actus Apostolorum & Apocalipsim noscitur continere.* The Compiler of the *Correction of Sorbonne* altogether follows the method that we use at present in our Vulgar. Besides the small Sections which St. *Jerom* calls *Cola & Com-mata*, that are exactly marked in the Text of these fair Manuscripts that remain in the King's Library and in those of M. *Colbert*, and of the *Benedictins* of St. *Germain des Prez*, we find therein a distinction of great Sections under the title of *Capitula*; they are marked at the beginning of every Book in form of Contents, and in imitation of the Greek Copies. Some Manuscripts contain seventy three in St. *Matthew's* Gospel, others seventy four, and others seventy six, not perfectly agreeing in the number of these Sections: They are also distinguished in the Body of the Book by figures in the Margent, that answer to as many distinctions in the Text; but the Transcribers have not been always exact in adjusting them with the number specified at the beginning of the Books in the forms of Summaries or Contents.

It would be too tedious here to produce to a Catalogue of them in particular: It is sufficient to observe in general the distribution of the Books of the New Testament according to St. *Jerom's* Edition: That which I have mentioned concerning the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, is equally found in all the other Books, wherein is counted a much greater number of these Sections, called *Capitula*, than we have in our Vulgar; there are for Example twenty in the Epistle of St. *James*, twenty one in the first of St. *Peter*, forty eight in the Revelation, and so of the others. It may be remarked nevertheless, that there is another division in the most part of these ancient Manuscripts, especially of those that contain only the New Testament, which comes nearer to our Chapters; for there are reckoned, according to this division, but twenty eight Sections in St. *Matthew*, as in our Edition; thirteen in St. *Mark*; twenty one in St. *Luke*, and fourteen in St. *John*. These are the great Sections of St. *Jerom's* Edition, which are marked at the beginning of every Gospel in many MSS. under the title of *Breviarium*, or a Summary; insomuch that there are for example, twenty eight Summaries or Arguments in St. *Matthew*, which comprehend all that is contained in this Gospel: The first Summary is comprised in these words, *Nativitas Christi. Magi cum muneribus veniunt, & Joseph per visum ab Angelo admonitus.* The Nativity of Christ. The Wise-men come with Gifts, and Joseph is admonished in a vision by an Angel. The second Summary is thus expressed, *Regressio Jesu ex Aegypto in Nazareth. De Baptismate Joannis in Jordane. De Christi Baptismate.* The return of Jesus out of Aegypt into Nazareth. Of the Baptism of John in Jordan. Of the Baptism of Christ. There are others in like manner on the whole New Testament: For the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. *Paul* have their Summaries or Contents

tents as well as the Gospels; and there are as many great Sections distinguished in the Text that answer to these Summaries.

The Copiers that are exact, writ the first words of these great Sections in red Letters, to distinguish them from the rest of the Text, and the numbers of the Sections are described in the Margent; there are to be seen besides this, other lesser distinctions that may be called *Cola & Commata*. The learned *Cassiodorus* hath made mention of all these Ornaments which ought to attend the Copies of these Sacred Books, that they may be read with more ease, and which served to facilitate the understanding of them, because by the means of these Sections that divided the whole Work, the confusion was avoided that was visible in the most part of the *Latin* Bibles before the time of *St. Jerom*. We find also in the *Latin* Bibles, written since the Reign of *Charles* the Great, the distinction of Points marked very exactly: Two sorts of Points are distinguished in some, *viz.* the greater and the lesser; the great Point is that which concludes the sense, and is generally followed with a great Letter, which denotes that the word beginning with it immediately precedes another Period: This great Letter on the contrary, is not written after the little Point that answers to our Comma: The same thing is observed chiefly in the Books that were appropriated to the use of the Church; therefore certain Lessons of the Gospels and Epistles that are recited in the Church throughout the whole year, have been inserted in these Manuscripts. In a word, not to repeat what hath been said concerning the *Synaxaria* of the *Greek* MSS. in the first part of this Work, the method of the *Greek* Copies hath been punctually imitated in the *Latin*.

St. Jerom made another sort of division in his *Latin* Edition, which he took from the *Greek* Copies, and which hath not been observed with sufficient exactness by the Transcribers in the *Latin* Manuscripts; it is that which relates to the ten Canons of *Eusebius*, and hath been very useful in removing the confusion that was in the *Latin* Copies before *St. Jerom*'s Correction. It were much to be desired that the distinction of Verses which is at this day in all our Bibles, had not been invented in our Time, because it often interrupts the sense: It would have been more convenient to retain the ancient division of the *Greek* Copies, that was made by the means of little Sections, which are seen not only in divers *Greek* Editions of the Gospels, but also in some printed *Latin* Gospels. We may thereupon consult the Text of the four Evangelists that were printed with *St. Jerom*'s Works. I could wish that no Edition of the New Testament should be published, whether in *Greek* or *Latin*, or even in any other Language, without affixing thereto these little Sections with the ten Canons of *Eusebius*, because this serves as a Concordance to the Gospels. It is also worth the observing, that the word *Canon* in the *Latin* MSS. has often a different signification from what is understood by the Canons of *Eusebius*: I have found in some of them at the beginning

ginning or at the end of every Book, particularly in the Epistles of *St. Paul*, the number of the Canons, which are nothing else but the Summaries of what is contained in each Section; so that a Canon is that which is elsewhere called a Chapter or Section. *St. Hilary* hath followed this method in his Commentary upon *St. Mathew*, which he divided into a certain number of Canons that answer almost to our Chapters.

Altho the most part of the Copiers, in those times, transcribed the Sacred Writings with a great deal of confusion, and without any distinction of Sections, nevertheless they forbore not to make use of them, especially in the Churches, where it was necessary to divide the reading of these Books into a determined number of Sections; but they neglected to set them down, contenting themselves to add at the end of each Book the number of Verses of which it was composed: This ancient custom of marking the Verses at the end of the Books, in the MSS. Copies of *St. Jerom's* Bible, hath been retained, tho the confusion that was in the Manuscripts of the Bible before *St. Jerom*, was taken away by means of the divisions and subdivisions above-mentioned. Those Verses, as has been elsewhere shewn, did not answer to the Verses of the *Jews* that are at present expressed in all our Bibles, as to the Old Testament, nor to those which have been added in our Times to the Books of the New Testament. Moreover, the number of these Verses which is set down in some old Copies of *St. Jerom's* Bible, is different from that *Stichometry*, of which we treated in the first part of this Critical History. Were I not afraid of being tiresome by a too tedious description of these minute Circumstances, I could produce, in particular, the number of the Verses after the same manner as I found them in several ancient Copies of *St. Jerom's* Bible. But this may be hereafter more conveniently performed on another occasion.

C H A P. XI.

Of the best Editions of the Latin Bibles: Critical Observations upon these different Editions.

THE first Edition of our *Latin Bibles* are full of faults, because they were taken from Manuscripts which were not correct; nevertheless there are some in which there are placed in the Margent several various readings; but they have all this defect, that a great number of Prefaces are therein inserted without any distinction, under the name of *St. Jerom*. Cardinal *Ximenes* was one of the first who took pains to give us a more correct Edition of the *Vulgar* than we had before; for this end he consulted divers Manuscript

script Copies, and likewise the Originals themselves: But besides that it is not always a certain way to reform the ancient *Latin* Edition by the Originals; he hath not taken notice of the qualifications of the *Latin* Manuscripts which he followed, contenting himself to put into the Text of his Edition, that reading which he judged to be the best: He has there likewise annexed all the Prefaces which we lately mentioned, so that there is found at the beginning of the Canonical Epistles, the Preface which is in all the first Editions of the *Latin* Bible.

It is no wonder that this great number of Prefaces that are seen in the most part of the Manuscripts hath been printed in these first Editions; but there is just cause of astonishment to hear complaints at this day, that some of them have been omitted in the last Editions of the Bible. The Bishop of *Oxford*, who has lately published Notes on the Works of St. *Cyprian*, after having produced some old Editions, all which have a Preface before the Catholic Epistles, but is not in the New, (a) cannot apprehend how it could happen to be left out in these, especially since it was in the Manuscripts, and mention being made thereof in the Commentaries of those that have expounded these Epistles. They that make such Objections never examined the MS. Copies wherein this Preface is found, with many others under the name of St. *Jerom*, which nevertheless do not belong to this Father: Some of them indeed are his; but if we except two that are before the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, the greater part of the others are forged, or they were not composed by St. *Jerom* on purpose to be prefixed to these Books, but they have been taken out of some part of his Works and added in those places: Moreover, that which evidently shews that they were not written by St. *Jerom*, is that the Manuscripts do not agree thereupon; for there are some, where two, or even many Prefaces are placed at the beginning of a Book, and in others there is but one. I am so far then from condemning those that have taken them out of the *Latin* Bibles, that I can find nothing but what is commendable in their proceedings. Robert Stephen is (as I believe) the first that left them out, having admitted none in his Editions, at least in those that I have read, that did not certainly appertain to St. *Jerom*. This Printer, who may be compared with the most able Critics, spared no cost in exhibiting to the World an exact Edition of our Vulgar, as it appears from that which he published in the year 1528. He declares in the Preface, that to perform his undertaking most faithfully, he perused an. 1523. all the good *Latin* Manuscripts of the Bibles that he could meet with in the Libraries of *Paris*, more especially in that of St. Ger-

(a) Mirari subit hanc D. Hieronymi epistolam, quæ crucem primum Erasmo, & dein Socino & ejus sequacibus figebat, quæque non modo ab ipsis, sed libris MSS. passim & fere omnibus codicibus impressis antiquioribus & interpretum commentariis agnita est --- hoc nostro seculo quasi prestigii quibusdam oculis perstringentibus prorsus disparuisse. Joann. Oxon. Not. in lib. Cyp. de Unit. Eccles. p. 109.

main des Prez, where he found two that were excellent, whose good qualifications he describes. (*b*) One of these Copies being very ancient, and transcribed with great exactness, had been revised and corrected by some of those Revisers whom I have above-mentioned.

Robert Stephen consulted, in like manner, the Library of the Abby of *St. Dennis*, where there was extant but one Copy that can be compared with those two, which he read in that of *St. Germain des Prez*. Moreover, he procured from *Spain* the Bible of Cardinal *Ximenes*, and examined it together by his own Manuscripts, with which it agreed almost in every particular : Lastly he had recourse to all the printed Bibles that came into his hands, chiefly those in which the various readings were inserted in the Margent. But notwithstanding the pains that this expert Critic then took to print an exact Text of our Vulgar, this Edition is very much inferiour to that which he published in the year 1540. and which may be called in some measure a Master-piece, with respect to the other Editions of the Bible. He collected in a particular Book the various readings of the MSS. that he had read, and those of the *Correctorium* of *Sorbonne* above-mentioned : This was the foundation on which he prepared a new Edition of the *Latin* Bible, wherein he annexed in the Margents the various readings of these Manuscripts, and of the best printed Bibles : He accomplished this design in the years 1539, and 1540. *Erasmus's* Notes on the New Testament afforded him very great assistance, because many good Manuscripts are cited therein.

I shall not here describe at large the Copies which *Robert Stephen* made use of in his Edition, anno 1540. for he hath given us a Catalogue of them himself in his Preface ; besides he hath set down in the Margents of his Bible, the number and the names of his Manuscripts, which renders his Edition more accurate than all the others. He seems to condemn in his Preface, (*c*) another *Latin* Bible which he had pub-

(*b*) *In manus nostras pervenit exemplar quoddam miræ vetustatis, quod ut manu diligenter scriptum, ita & a viris doctis, ut videre licet, accurate perlectum erat ; & si quando librarium vitio menda irrepsissent, tanto studio castigatum, ut non credam aliud usquam pari.* Rob. Steph. Præf. in edit. Bibl. Latin. ann. 1528.

(*c*) *Prodierant ante annos 18. e nostra typographica officina Biblia magna fide ad antiquissimos codices Latinos excusa. Tum enim virorum doctissimorum consilium fuit, ut ea lectio quæ in vetustissimis illis exemplaribus inventa fuisset, si cum Hebraicis Veteris Testamenti codicibus, aut Novi Testamenti libris consentiat, excudertur, ne variis & diversis lectionibus margines occupata essent. Quid consilium non caruit invidia, & nonnullos præter expectationem nostram offendit. Proinde alii non minoris eruditionis & judicii viri, quos ista offensus male habebat, admonuerunt me quam familiarissime, ut si quando rursus excutenda essent Biblia, ita rem temperaremus, ne quæ etiam levis offensus, ut olim, cuiquam offerretur. Quorum consilium non potuimus non probare, utpote qui paci & tranquillitati passim stauerimus. Sed antequam rem ipsi aggredieremur, censuimus in consilium adhibendos nostros Theologos, viros & judicio acerrimo & doctrina exactissima præditos, quorum sententia fuit, ut antiquissimos quoque codices excusos in exemplaria nobis proponeremus, ita tamen ut quæ aliter in vetustis his MSS. codicibus legerentur, & cum Hebraicis & Græcis libris amice conspirarent, ea margo interior nostrorum Bibliorum sibi vindicaret, nominibus exemplarium unde lectio desumpta esset fideliter expressis.* R. Steph. Præf. Bibl. ann. 1540.

lished eighteen years before ; where he had only printed in the Text the readings of his Copies, that agreed with the *Hebrew*, as for what relates to the Old Testament, and with the *Greek* as to the New, without specifying the various readings in the Margents : He declares, that altho he had done nothing in this affair but according to the advice of several Learned Men, nevertheless his Work gave offence to some persons ; therefore he took a resolution, after he had deliberated thereupon with very judicious Divines, to print the *Latin* Copies of the Vulgar that was in the hands of the people, annexing in the Margents of his Edition the various readings of the MSS. and shewing at the same time the places where they agreed with the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Originals. I have not seen this Edition of 1522. It seems to me not to be the same with that mentioned in the Censure that the Faculty of Divinity of *Paris* made against the Bibles of *Robert Stephen*, the most ancient of those that they censured being dated *anno* 1528. However it be, it cannot be denied but that this learned Printer acted prudently in his Edition of 1540. The design was to print the Vulgar, and not a new Version out of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Text ; therefore it was necessary to exhibit that Edition which the general custom of many Ages had authorized throughout all the Western Churches.

However, notwithstanding all his precaution in publishing this Bible, he could not escape the censure of the Doctors of *Paris*, which I shall here relate, to shew the Editions of the *Latin* Bibles, printed by *Robert Stephen* that have been censured. *Anno Domini* 1548. die 15. mensis Maii Sacra Theologia Facultas post Socrosancta de Sancto Spiritu Missa celebrationem apud S. Matthurinum sacramento fidei convocata, perlectis & animadversis erroribus contentis in Bibliis Roberti Stephani excusis anno 1528, 1532, 1534, 1540, 1545, & 1546. nec non in Novis Testamentis per eundem impressis annis 1541, 1543, 1545. ac etiam in Psalterio seu libro Psalmorum Davidis cum annotationibus ex Hebraeorum commentariis seorsim excuso ; denique in indicibus editis annis 1528, 1532, 1540, & 1546. communi omnium calculo conclusit predicta Biblia, Nova Testamenta, Psalterium seu librum Psalmorum, cum annotationibus ex Hebraeorum commentariis, & indices dictorum Bibliorum juxta designatum sui temporis annum ob errores in iis contentos & hareses suppressione digna, atque in communem librorum reprobatorum catalogum reponenda. These Divines might have more gently treated a man that had sustained excessive charges to furnish us with correct *Latin* Bibles ; they ought, at least, to have spared this fair Edition of 1540. in which is contained only the Text and the various readings : My design is not to write an History of the long disputes that this Printer maintained with the Doctors of *Paris* under the Reigns of *Francis* I. and *Henry* II. neither do I pretend to approve his Notes in their whole extent, much the less Answer that he made to these Divines, wherein he fixes very ill interpretations on matters that might admit a good meaning : I would give an account of the best Editions of his Bibles. The Censure of

Cens. Bib.
lior. Rob.
Steph.

of *Paris* ought not to hinder us from reading this fair Edition, published in the year 1540. where *Robert Stephen* professes to reprint, with all possible fidelity, the *Latin* Copies that were used in our Churches, only adding in the Margents the various readings which he had collected, with extream diligence, from many Copies as well printed as MSS. *Comparatis* (saith he) & *conflatis undique mira vetustatis codicibus*, aliis ante multos annos scriptis, aliis vero jam inde ab ipsa typographi-
ces infantia excusis, assiduis & improbis laboribus tandem perfecimus, ut e-
tralatio qua nostra Ecclesia passim utuntur, dum sacros libros aut recitant, aut decantant, ne verbo quidem uno mutato typis imprimeretur. Varias au-
tem & a multis seculis repetitas lectiones, qua tamen cum Hebraico & Graeco contextu consentiebant, in margine interiori magna diligentia & fide excudendas curavimus. Rob. Steph. ib.

I shall only produce here an example of his exactness, from whence we may judge of this whole Edition of 1540. and especially of the New Testament, that bears date anno 1539. There is no place of Scripture in which the *Latin* Copies vary more than that in the seventh Verse of the fifth Chapter of the I. Epistle of St. John. *Robert Stephen*, according to the design that he proposed to himself, recites this passage at length, in his Edition, after the same method as it is read in our *Latin* Bibles: But he represents it in such a manner as makes it appear that it was not inserted in many *Latin* Manuscripts, marking the words that were not found in these MSS. the names of which he puts in the Margent, with a Point or Obelisk; and they are these that follow, *In Cælo Pater, Verbum & Spiritus Sanctus; & hi tres* Vet. Di. unum sunt: Et tres sunt qui testimonium dant in Terra: In Heaven the o. l. Ger. l. Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one; and there Do. are three that bear witness in Earth. He caused this *Latin* New Testament to be printed in a small Volume in the years 1543, and 1545. (d) where he observes the same rule as to the Text, but he doth not set down in the Margents the names nor the number of the Manuscripts; he contents himself to express them in general, adding for example, these three letters *Vet.* when he would shew the reading of the ancient *Latin* Copies in those places where they agree with the *Greek*. Moreover the same Asterisks and Obelisks are seen in these two Editions, as in his large Volume in Folio, printed in the year 1539. and he thereby distinguishes what is redundant and what is wanting in the *Latin* Text, as it is in the *Greek*; besides this,

(d) Veterum tralationem ea fide & religione excudimus, ut ne voculam quidem illius prudentes ac scientes mutaverimus. Deinde lectionem veterum codicum Latinorum cum Græcis libris congruentem in margine interiori collocavimus isto trium literarum compendio adscripto, Vet. quod lectionis veteris lectorem admoneret. -- Hebraicas vero dicendi formulas quæ passim occurrunt hoc compendio Heb. designavimus, quod Hebraïsmum significat. Asteriscos & obeliscos non omisimus. R. Steph. Præf. N. T. in min. edit. for. anno 1543. & 1545.

he explains by the means of little notes the *Hebraisms* with which the New Testament abounds, and several other difficult matters, particularly those that relate to the Critical Art.

These two Editions of the New Testament chiefly drew upon him the Censures of the Divines of *Paris*, who condemned divers Articles in the Notes and Summaries; but this is not a proper place to examine them: I shall only say thus much in general, that *Robert Stephen* had purposely inserted therein some ambiguous expressions that favoured the Opinions of the Protestants, which perhaps would not have been so severely reflected on at another time; but it was then dangerous to authorize these Bibles. Therefore the Divines of *Louvain* likewise censured the Edition of 1545. tho it was Printed with the permission of *Francis I.* and published a Catalogue of the Errors that they found therein. This Prince in a Letter dated *Octob. 27. 1546.* forbade the Doctors of *Paris* to imitate those of *Louvain* in this particular: He ordered them to revise this Bible, and to collect the faults, *that they might be Printed at the end of every Book.* But they, not judging this to be sufficient to prevent the mischief, afterwards presented several Petitions to *Henry II.* who at last having approved their Arguments, by reason of the disorder that Heresy had caused in *France*, wrote a Letter to them bearing date *Novemb. 25. 1548.* to this effect: *Chers & bien ames ayant bien poise & considere les remontrances que nous aves faites sur le fait des Bibles imprimees par R. Estienne, & ne voulant aucunement tolerer ne permettre chose qui soit pour detourner nos sujets de la droit voye Catholique . . . a cette cause nous voulons & entendons que vous metties les dites Bibles au catalogue des Livres reprovez & defendus, si vous trouvez en icelles aucunes erreurs qui en rendent la lecture scandalense & pernicieuse, non obstant toutes lettres que pourrions cy-devant avoir donnees au contraire.* Dear and well beloved, having deliberately weighed and considered the remonstrances that you have exhibited to us on the account of the Bibles Printed by *R. Stephen*, and not being willing by any means to tolerate or permit any thing that tends to divert our subjects from the right Catholic way---- for this reason we require you to put the said Bibles in the Catalogue of disallowed and prohibited Books, if you find in them any errors that render the reading scandalous and pernicious, notwithstanding all Letters that we may have heretofore given out to the contrary. The Book-sellers very much opposed these proceedings, and insisted that a Catalogue of the errors should be annexed at the begining of every Book in form of *Errata*; but their opposition was not regarded; for the Bibles and new Testaments of *Robert Stephen* were placed in the number of prohibited Books: And this learned Printer being unfortunately infected with Calvinism, retired at last to *Geneva*, where he caused an answer to the Divines of *Paris* to be Printed in the year 1552.

Bibl.
Joann.
Hent.
edit. ann.
1547.

Johannes Hentenius about the time of this Dispute of *R. Stephen* with the Doctors of *Paris*, published a new Edition of the Vulgar, which he had revised by many *Latin Manuscripts*: This Critic acknowledges in his Preface the great services that *Robert Stephen* had performed to the

the Church by procuring very exact and correct Bibles; *accuratissima & castigatissima Biblia*: He speaks only concerning those Editions that were Printed without Notes and Summaries, and more especially that of 1540. which this Divine hath punctuallay followed; but he contents himself only to put the number of the Manuscripts in the Margent, without expressing their names: As for the Notes, Summaries and Prefaces, in which many things were inserted that did not seem to be orthodox, he lays the blame on others, who had (as he says) maliciously added them therein. *Candido hujus pectori* (saith he speaking of R. Stephen) *imposuerunt hi Pseudochristiani, & sub ovina pelle latentes lupi rapaces, maxime in marginum annotationibus, prafationibus ac indice sententiarum.* But he is mistaken, for this Printer himself confesses that he was the Author and them.

Joann.
Hent.

Præf. Bibl.

edit. Lo-
van. ann.

1547.

This Edition of *Hentenius* is the first of the *Louvain* Bibles that were corrected by the ancient *Latin* Copies: Although the name of *Hentenius* only appears in the Title, nevertheless it may be attributed in general, to the Divines of the University of *Louvain*: For the Author assures us in his Preface, that he hath done nothing but by the Order of the most learned and judicious of these Divines, after he had received many instructions from them; *ex jussu, instructione ac judicio gravissimorum longeque eruditissimorum & acerrimi judicii Theologorum hujus Academiae Lovaniensis.* Moreover, he gives an account of the method that he hath used in his Edition, and of the number of the Manuscripts which he consulted, besides those of *Stephen*, whom he hath imitated almost in every particular: He peremptorily vindicates the authority of the *Vulgar* which was received for so many Ages in the Western Churches: And altho he does not pretend that it is exempt from all sorts of faults, yet he would not have it corrected by the *Greek* and *Hebrew*. He adds, that if it were expedient to reform it after any other manner whatsoever, this work belongs rather to Popes or a General Council, than to private persons, or even to Professors of Divinity. Therefore all his reformation tends only to exhibit the *Vulgar* Edition of the *Latin* Bible as correct as possible, it could be, in imitation of *Robert Stephen*. He hath only taken care (as I have already observed) to place in the Margent the number of the Copies that confirm any reading: However, he is not always exact in his marks; as for example, in the I. Epistle of St. *John* Chap. 5. v. 7. instead of cutting off by a point or Obelisk all these words, *in cælo Pater, Verbum & Spiritus Sanctus, & hi tres unum sunt. Et tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra; in Heaven the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth; the Obelisk falls only on these in cælo, in heaven,* and this mark---5. is added in the Margent, to shew that they are not read in five Copies. There is another Edition of this Bible at *Antwerp* in the year 1572.

Hent.
ibid.

The *Louvain* Divines not being altogether satisfied with the Edition of *Hentenius*, corrected it in some places, and consulted likewise the Originals

nals themselves to judge better of the true readings of the *Latin Translation*: This is the principal reason alledged by them in the Preface of their new Edition published in the year 1573. (e) in which they commend their Brother *Hentenius* for the care that he took in comparing together many *Latin Manuscripts*; but they do not believe that he hath always had good success in the choice that he made of the readings which ought to be admitted into the Text of the *Vulgar*, because he neglected to have recourse to the *Hebrew* and *Greek* in those places where it was necessary. These Divines who performed this Work with a great deal of judgment, in obedience to the Decree of the Council of *Trent*, have inserted in the Margents of their Edition, not only the various readings of the *Latin Manuscripts*, but also those of the *Hebrew*, *Chaldaic* and *Greek* of the *Septuagint*, as to the *Old Testament*, and those of the *Greek Text* and *Syriac Version* in the *New*. Moreover, we find therein the names of *St. Jerom*, *St. Augustin*, *St. Gregory*, *Beda*, and several other Ecclesiastical Writers, to confirm certain readings. There would have been nothing wanting to the perfection of this Edition, if the names of the MSS. had been specified as they are in the curious *Latin Edition* of *Robert Stephen*, and if their antiquity and other qualifications had been described in a distinct discourse: But the Method of *Hentenius* was followed in this, who only sets down their number; and they themselves confess that with respect to the *New Testament* they have only caused the Text to be reprinted which this Doctor had published at *Louvain* in the year 1547. *Is ipse novi Testamenti textus qui in Bibliis Lovanii anno 1547. ex commissione Facultatis Theologiae a D. Jo. Hentenio castigatus fuit editus, hac editione integer prodit*: Nevertheless they sometimes make mention of a greater number of Manuscripts and various readings, because they perused some Copies which *Hentenius* had not consulted. *Ad exemplaria (say they) Vulgata Editionis Manuscripta eaque antiquissima & correctissima infinitis locis iterum est collatus, & nunc Manuscriptorum numerus auctus, nunc varia lectio*. Moreover, these Divines have added at the end of their Edition, certain Notes on the principal variations, and they refer to them in the Margent by these two letters q. n. that is to say, *quare notationes*. It will be convenient to illustrate all this by an example, that we may better apprehend the usefulness of the *Louvain Bibles* which are too much neglected at present.

They have Printed the passage in the I. Epistle of *St. John* Chap. 5. v. 7. after the same manner as it is in the Edi-

(e) Navavit quidem ante annos aliquot in conferendis ad manuscripta & castigandis Bibliis sane laudandam operam nostrae Facultatis Doctor Johannes Hentenius. Verum cum is multas & non contemnendas *Vulgatae Editionis* lectiones non reperit, tum eas quas reperit ad *Sacra Scripturae fontes*, minime revocavit; ita factum est, ut loca plurima merito corrigenda ejus diligentiam fugerint. Præfat. Bibl. Lovan. edit. ann. 1573.

tion of *Hentenius*; but they have corrected it by comprising all these words under the Obelisk, *in cælo Pater, Verbum & Spiritus Sanctus, & hi tres unum sunt. Et tres sunt qui Testimonium dant; in Heaven the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness.* They have also put in the Margent ----- 5. mss. b. f. q. n. to signify that these same words are not found in five Manuscripts, in the Works of *Beda*, nor in the *Syriac* Version: And lastly, that the Notes which are at the end ought to be thereupon consulted. The Note relating to this place is as follows. (f) "Several *Greek* Copies agree as to this particular with the *Syriac* and the *Latin* that are cited in the Margent. Moreover, it is expressly declared in the ancient Correction produced by *Dr. Hunnans*, that this passage was not found in the *Greek* Copies, nor in the *Latin* that were ancient. Many of the Fathers do also confirm this, viz. amongst the *Latin*, *St. Augustin*, *St. Leo* and *Beda*; and amongst the *Greek*, *St. Cyril* and *Oecumenius*: And the most part as well of these Authors as of these Copies do not express these words in *Terra*, in *Earth*. But *St. Jerom* complains in his Preface before the Catholic Epistles, of the unfaithfulness and negligence of the *Latin* Interpreters, who have omitted the Testimony of the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost. This confirms the reading, of the Text, which is likewise supported by a great number of *Latin* Copies, as also by two *Greek* MSS. cited by *Erasmus*, one of Great Britain, and the other of Spain. The Royal Bible of *Philip II.* is every where conformable to this last. We have seen many others of the like nature: And this same passage is read in all those of *R. Stephen*, there being only seven of them that have not in *Cælo*, in *Heaven*, at least if the semi-circle that shews what

(f) Codicibus Syris illisque Latinis non pauca Græcorum exemplarium consentiunt. Antiquum etiam Correctorium quod M. N. Hunnans contribuit deesse hæc ipsa libris Græcis & antiquis Latinis annotat. His & multi veterum Patrum suffragantur, inter Latinos *Augustinus*, lib. 3. contra *Maximum*, c. 22. *Leo* Epist. 10. c. 5. *Beda* hanc enarrans scripturam; inter Græcos *Cyrillus*, lib. 4. thes. c. 5. *Oecum.* in hunc scribens locum, & horum tum auctorum tum codicum plerique etiam in terra auferunt. *Hieronymus* autem Prefatione in Catholicas Epistolas ab infidelibus translatoribus Patris Verbiq. ac Spiritus Testimonium omissum queritur. Quod pro textus lectione facit, cui & Latino-rum Aborum plurimi suffragantur, quibus consentientes duos Græcos codices, unum Britannicum, alterum Hispanicum, *Erasmus* profert. Hispanico ut ubique & hic conformis est Regius. Multos alios his consonantes vidimus: Inter omnes *Stephani* ne unus est qui dissideat, nisi quod 7. duratæat & in cælo confodiant; si tamen semicirculus lectionis designans terminum suo loco sit collocatus. Eidem lectioni, *Higini* a B. Petro Papæ noni lectio quæ in prima ejus Epistola extat accedit. Not. in N. T. edit. Lov. 1574. ad Epist. I. Joann. c. 5. vers. 7.

" is not read in his MSS. be not removed from its proper place.
 " Lastly Pope *Higinus*, who was the ninth Bishop of *Rome* from
 " *St. Peter*, approves this reading.

Approb.
 Joann.
 Mol. Libb.
 Cens.

This Collection of various readings, and that of the Critical Remarks which these Divines have caused to be Printed at the end of the first Editions of their Bible, are of very great use. *Molanus*, who allowed them, affirms in his approbation that they were collected according to an express order of the Faculty of Divines of *Louvain*. *Has Novi Testamenti varias lectiones*, (says this Censor) *ex diversis Vulgata Editionis manuscriptis exemplaribus, olim quidem ex commissione Facultatis nostra Theologica magna ex parte collectas, nunc vero ex ejusdem Facultatis commissione auctas & fideliter examinatas vidi & probavi anno 1573. die 28. Augusti. J. Molanus Lovaniensis Apostolicus Regiusque Librorum Censor, & pro tempore Decanus Facultatis Theologia Lovaniensis.* These Notes were left out in the later Editions of the *Louvain* Bibles, tho they were inserted at the end of the first, and the Divines always referred to them with these two letters *q. n.* it being thought convenient to Print them separately and much larger. Indeed *Lucas Brngensis* published them in one Volume in 4°. anno. 1580. which ought necessarily to be joined with the Edition of the *Louvain* Bible, if we would have a perfect description of our Vulgar.

Præf. Bibl.
 Lat. edit.
 Francof.
 ad Mæn.
 ann. 1566.

Before this second Edition of *Louvain* Divines appeared, *Hentenius's* Bible was Printed in many places; for since the name of *Robert Stephen* was become odious by reason of the Censure that was made of his Bibles, none durst reprint them: One of the fairest Editions of *Hentenius's* Bible is that of *Francfort* in the year 1566. The Printer declares that he chose it before all the others, because it was most correct and generally approved by all Catholics. *Qua correctissima esset, & omni apud Orthodoxos vereque Christianos lectores offensione usque careret.* It was also Printed by *Guillaume Rouilli* a Book-seller of *Lions*, with the privilege of *Charles IX.* obtained anno 1572. His Heirs Reprinted it at the same place in 1598. adding thereto an Index of the principal matters contained in the H. Scriptures, composed by the Jesuit *Harlemius*. The custom then was not to publish any exact Edition of the Bible without various readings. It seems they did not so soon obey the Bulls of Pope *Sixtus V.* and *Clement VIII.* the first of which is dated 1589. and the other 1592. prohibiting the impressiion of any other Vulgar, but conformably to their correction: However at last they submitted to the Declarations of the Court of *Rome*; and this is the cause that these fair Editions of the *Latin* Translation, wherein the various readings are expressed in the Margents with so much diligence, are become extremely scarce.

Sixtus V. expressly forbid in his Bull the Printing of any *Latin* Bible but by the Copy of the *Vatican*, *Nemo sanctas Scripturas typis mandare praesumat, nisi habito prius exemplari in typographia Vaticana excuso*. He therein (g) aggravates the distraction and doubts that may arise in the Mind of those that read the Holy Scriptures on the occasion of these various readings that were added in the Margents of many *Latin* Bibles; therefore he ordained that to preserve a perfect uniformity in all the Editions of the Bible, no diversity of reading should for the future be Printed in the Margents. This Decree hath (in my opinion) been too scrupulously observed in the most part of the Editions of our *Latin* Bibles: For *Clement VIII.* whose Bull ought rather to be esteemed as a Law, than that of *Sixtus V.* as being later, makes no mention of these various readings: It is true, that the Censors of *Rome* who annexed a Preface by the Order of this *Pope* at the beginning of his Edition, do likewise forbid them; but this prohibition relates only to the Margents of the Bibles, where they would not have them to be inserted: *Ita tamen ut lectiones variae ad Marginem ipsius Textus minime annotentur*. They did not hinder them from being added at the end, as Critical observations. However it be, it is certain at least that mention is made in this place only of the *Vulgar* Edition corrected by this *Pope's* special Command, and by no means of those of *Robert Stephen* and of the *Louvain* Divines, which ought to be read as excellent Critical Works on the Bible, together with the learned remarks of *Lucas Brugenfis*.

Many other *Latin* Bibles were published before the reformation of *Sixtus V.* and *Clement VIII.* But the Authors of these Editions have made use of a method altogether different from that of the *Louvain* Divines. *Simon de Colines* Printed in the year 1541. the Bible of *Johannes Benedictus*, a Divine of *Paris*, who pretends to purge the *Vulgar* from an infinite number of faults, as appears by this Title; *Biblia Sacra juxta Vulgatam quam dicunt Editionem a mendis, quibus innumeris, partim Scribarum incuria, partim scolarum audacia scatebat, summa cura parique fide repurgata, atque ad priscorum probatissimorumque exemplariorum Normam*,

Sixt. V.
Præf. in
Bibl. Lat.

Præf.
Cens.
Rom. ante
Bibl.
Clem.
VIII.

Bibl.
Joann.
Bened.
edit. a
Sim.
Colin.

(g) Quoniam ex variis quæ hætenus ad marginem adscribi consueverunt lectionibus, illud sequitur incommodi ac molestiæ, quod cum primum hujusmodi varietas oculis obijciatur, lectoris animus ab eo quod tunc instat agendum arceat, illumque alieno plane tempore ad ea quæ in codicibus dissonant inter se conferenda traducit, nec facile, est in tanta lectionum multiplicitate Scripturas inoffenso pede percurrere, & ea, quasi silva diversitatis oblata, quæ, quibus præponenda sint internoscere; nos optimum factum, piii que omnibus gratum fore arbitrati, ut Ecclesiæ filii ab his perplexitatibus ejusdem Ecclesiæ judicio liberentur — auctoritate & tenore præmissis mandamus, ut *Vulgaræ* Editionis *Biblia* post hæc nonnisi uniformia imprimantur, nec aliquid a textu diversum in margine scribatur. *Sixt. V.* Præf. in Bibl. Lat.

adhibita

adhibita interdum fontium auctoritate, Johannis Benedicti Parisiensis Theologi industria restituta. This Bible hath been reprinted several times at *Paris*, and I have seen three other Editions with the same Title. The Author gives an account of his design in a small Preface prefixt to this Work. He declares moreover, that there being as many different Copies of the Vulgar; as there are various Editions, (h) he hath thought it convenient to compare divers Copies, as well Printed as Manuscripts, one with another, and afterwards with the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Texts, to the end that he might restore the ancient *Latin* Edition to its primitive purity: He subjoyns, that he doth not so absolutely rely on Antiquity, but that he hath corrected according to his ability, the Text which was used in all our Churches.

Ibid. He pretends to have imitated St. *Jerom*, by affixing certain Asterisks and Obelisks in the Text of the Vulgar, to distinguish what is wanting and what is redundant in our Version as well as in the Originals. *Collatis* (says he) *Latinis codicibus cum Hebrais qui nobis ex Hebraeo Canone traduntur, atque cum Graecis qui tantum Graece leguntur, differentias quibus antea Hieronymus, annotavimus, asterisco, inquam, in quibus Latina a peregrina deficit editio; obelo in quibus abundat.* But besides that this is not the true way of reestablishing St. *Jerom*'s Version, it is also subject to illusion, especially when a Man that hath not an exact knowledge of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Languages, undertakes to insert these Asterisks and Obelisks. Indeed, *Joannes Benedictus* is apparently mistaken in two several passages in the very beginning of St. *Matthew*'s Gospel, viz. in Chap. i. v. 11. where he puts an Asterisk after these words, *Josias autem genuit*, And *Josias* begat, and these other words in the Margent, * *Joachim*. *Joachim autem genuit*, And *Joachim* begat, as if they were wanting in the Vulgar, and were expressed in the *Greek*; but it is certain that there are but very few *Greek* Copies in which they are found, and we may judge by a Critical enquiry that it is a Gloss which hath passed from the Margent into the Text of these Copies. Again, he falls into an error in the 23. Verse of the same Chapter, where he cuts off by a point or Obelisk these words, *quod est interpretatum nobiscum Deus*, which being interpreted is, *God with us*, and are in the *Greek* of St. *Matthew*, and ought in some manner to be esteemed by us, as the Original, because we have

(h) Huic autem morbo utique mederi volentes, quos potuimus vetustissimos & scriptos manu & impressos inter se codices, & illos tandem cum Hebrais Graecisque contulimus, ut veriore Editionis nostrae sensum integritati suae restitueremus; nec tamen tantum vetustati tribuimus, quin Ecclesiae usum, & qui passim legitur & cantatur in templis textum pro capiti reformaremus. Joann. Bened. Praef. in Bibl. Lat.

not the *Hebrew* or *Chaldaic* Text of this Evangelist. It were need-
less particularly to examin the other places of this Edition, in which
no various readings are specified, and consequently there can be no
certain rule for his reformation; nevertheless it may be useful to
those that desire to know wherein the *Vulgar* differs from the *Hebrew*
in the Old Testament, and from the *Greek* in the New; for besides
the Asterisks and Obelisks, the Author hath added in the Margent a
new interpretation of those words that he believed not to be literally
translated in our *Latin* Edition; but it cannot be imagined that all his
corrections are so many faults in the *Vulgar*: For he often alters it
without any necessity, according to the New Translations of the Bi-
ble that have been made from the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Originals.

I have elsewhere treated of the method used by *Isidorus* a Monk of *Mont Cassin*, and afterwards a Bishop, in reforming the *Vulgar*, as to
the Books of the old Testament; and since he exactly follows it in the
New, we ought to judge thereof in the same manner: He had rea-
son to prefer (in the Council of *Trent*) St. *Jerom's* Version before all
others, and to propose that it should be corrected, that it might be
made more exact; but when he insisted that it ought only to be reform-
ed by the Original Text, he fell into those inconveniences that he
intended to avoid, by rejecting all the other Translations. I have seen
two entire Editions of his Bible, and his New Testament hath been
printed separately at *Venice* in the year 1451. with this Title: *Novi*
Testamenti vera quidem Editio, sed quæ ad vetustissimorum utriusque lingua
exemplarium fidem tum demum emendata est diligentissime ut nova non de-
sideretur, auctore Isidoro Clario Monacho Cassinate. It seems this Monk
designed to obtrude his *Latin* Edition of the New Testament as a Rule
to all the Western Churches; but the Court of *Rome* was too judicious
to esteem a Bible so ill digested, in which the Author, under pretence
of adhering to the Originals, very often follows his own *Capricio*; he
was so little exercised in the reading of good Manuscripts, that he
sometimes inserts in his Text those readings that are the least au-
thorized.

Isidorus takes the *Greek* for his Guide in those places where he is less
exact than the *Vulgar*; he annexes for example, in the 6th Chapter
of St. *Matthew*, vers. 13. after these words *a malo*, from evil, these
others conformably to the *Greek*, *quia tuum est Regnum, & Potentia, &*
Gloria, in secula, for thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory,
for ever; nevertheless it is apparent to all the World, that in this pas-
sage there is a Gloss in the *Greek* which is not in the *Latin*; wherefore
Lucas Brugensis hath judiciously observed, that it ought not to be added
in the *Vulgar*. *Non addendum* (says this able Critic) *quia tuum est, &c.*
It is read in Chap. 8. v. 30. of the same Gospel, in all the *Latin* Co-
pies, *erat autem non longe ab illis, and there was not far from them.*
Neither is there any difference as to this particular in the Bibles of *Ro-*
bert Stephen, and of the *Louvain* Divines; however *Isidorus* who had

Hist. Crit.
du V. T.
l. 2. c. 21.

Nov. Test.
Ibid. Clar.
edit. ann.
1541.

Luc. Brug.
Correct.
Rom. a. 6.
Matth. B.
13.

Bened.
Turret.
Def. des
Bibl. de
Gen. p. 26.

no other rule for his correction, but the *Greek Text*, hath inserted it thus in his Edition without the negative Particle, *erat autem longe ab illis*, there was a good way off from them. To avoid tediousness, I shall omit many other examples of the inadvertency and defects of this Writer in the reformation of the *Latin New Testament*: He believed also, that it was lawful for him to revise those places of the *Vulgar* that seemed to him to be rude and barbarous. Moreover, he took the liberty to translate a-new what he judged not very properly to express the words of the *Original Greek*: But he almost every where gives manifest proofs of his weakness; notwithstanding this, he forbears not boldly to affirm that he hath corrected eight thousand faults in the *Vulgar*. And it is to be admired that *Turretin*, *Spanhemius*, and some other Protestants have presumed to make use of the authority of this Monk, to prove that our *Latin Edition* doth really abound with an infinite number of faults: But either they have not read *Isidorous's Bible*, or they do not shew much sincerity in this affair.

Revis.
Bibl. Isid.
Clar.

The Censors who composed Rules for the Index of prohibited Books, have taken away the Preface that is in the Edition of 1542. and the Inquisition of *Spain* proceeded farther, having censured it in several places: But some of those of *Italy* were more moderate; for having examined the passages that had been censured by the Tribunal of *Spain*, they found but one Note on the Prophet *Zachary*, which deserved their Censure. The Copy of this Version that was revised by the order of an Inquisitor of *Italy* is extant in the King's Library, in which these words are written in the beginning of the Volume by the hand of the Reviser, *Ego Frater Jo. Baptista Ansaldus Lector Dominicus de commissione Reverendi Patris Inquisitoris Astensis vidi hanc Bibliam in omnibus locis suspectis & a supremo Senatu Sanctissime Inquisitionis taxatis, & eam nequaquam depravatam inveni praterquam in ultimo scholio super Zachariam, & eam emendavi. Quare me subscripsi Fr. Jo. Baptista.* The Note which was censured belongs to these words of the 14th Chapter of *Zachary*, *quod super frenum equi est*, that is on the Bridles of the Horses on which, *Isidorus* hath made this remark, *Per ornamenta equorum & ollas intelliguntur hic varii status Christianorum hominum, qui omnes sancti esse debent in Ecclesia, sicut olim pelves*: By the Ornaments of the Horses, and the Pots the various conditions of Christian men are here understood, who ought all to be holy in the Church, as the Basins, Vessels and other Sacred Urns were heretofore. The Censure falls on these words, *qui omnes sancti esse debent in Ecclesia, sicut olim pelves*, Who all ought to be holy in the Church as the Basins, &c. This expression perhaps would not have been censured at another time; but since it might be expounded according to the sense of the Protestants, it was thought convenient to expunge it out of *Isidorus's Bible*, the reading of which was judged expedient to be permitted in *Italy*, especially to the Monks who chiefly esteemed it.

This same *Italian* Inquisitor did not believe that it was necessary to leave out the whole Preface, but only these words which are defaced in the Copy that I have lately mentioned, *Sed duo mihi deesse adhuc videbantur. Nam in his horum omnium studiis atque laboribus editio illa qua totum Christianus orbis utitur, ac semper, ut facile conjecto usus est, nondum squallorem suum deposuerat, nec ei quisquam errores quibus innumeris scatebat adimere adhuc curaverat. Quae res eo magis reprehensione digna mihi videbatur, quo eorum major esset hac aetate copia qui huic malo mederi potuissent.* But two things seem to me yet to be wanting. For notwithstanding the industry and labour of all these men, that Edition which the whole Christian world now useth, and as I easily conjecture will always continue to allow, hath not as yet put off its deformity, neither hath any one taken care to clear it from those innumerable errors with which it abounded. Which matter, in my opinion, deserves so much the more reprehension, by how much the greater number there is in this time of persons who might have remedied this mischief. The Inquisitors had just cause to censure this passage of *Isidorus's* Preface, and they would have done much better, if they had altogether suppressed a Translation that was made according to such ill notions. But forasmuch as these Gentlemen are more expert in Plain Divinity than in the Critical Science, I do not wonder that they have tolerated it with these few corrections.

The Protestants have likewise caused some Editions of the *Latin* Version to be printed, which they have adjusted after their manner. We may observe what hath been said as to this point in the Critical History of the Old Testament when mention was made of the two *Oslanders*: Both these Divines have followed the same method in their New Testament, as they have done in the Old; They have published the ancient Edition with corrections taken from the *Greek*, nevertheless without diminishing any part of the *Latin* Text, which they represent entire; and if there be any thing in the *Greek* that is not in our Interpretation, they add it between two Crotchets; but when there happens any obscurity in the *Latin* words, or when they do not seem to be altogether clear, they explain them by other synonymous words which are printed in different Characters, that they might not confound them with the Text of the Vulgar: Their explication sometimes supplies the place of a Paraphrase; moreover, they have added Obelisks or little Points in those places where there is more in the *Latin* than in the *Greek*. It would have been much better (in my opinion) to insert these synonymous words or explications in the Margent, rather than in the Text; for although the matter which belongs to the Text may be always distinguished by the diversity of the Characters, yet the sense and coherence of the Discourse is thereby interrupted. As for example, in the first Chapter of *St. Luke* verse 1. after the word *rerum*, things, which is in the Vulgar, they have annexed these other words in *Italic* Letters, *Quoniam complures*

Cr't. Hist.
of the N.
Test. l. 2.
c. 21.

()
aggressi sunt contexere narrationem earum quae inter nos certissima sunt fidei rerum. Since many have undertaken to compose a narration of those things which are most certainly believed among us. This is another Interpretation of this Verse, which (as they believe) doth better express the force of the Greek words; they have done the same thing with respect to these words in the I. Epistle of St. John verse, 3. *Qui solvit Jesum, that abandons Jesus*; explaining them by these which are in the ordinary Greek, *Qui non confitetur Jesum Christum in Carnem venisse, that confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh.*

Bibl. Lat.
 Luc. Offi-
 and.

There have been many Editions of these *Latin Bibles* of the *Oslanders*, one of which I have perused that was printed at *Tubinga*, in *Quarto*, in the year 1593. without Notes, in which there is a Preface under this Title, *Præfatio Consistorii Theologici in Ducatu Wirtembergensi.* An account is given in this Preface of the design of the whole Work, which was to furnish Young Students with a Bible convenient for them. These Divines imagined that by their additions they had corrected a great number of faults which they pretended to be in our *Vulgar*; but if we carefully examine these additions, the most part of them will be found to be useless, and to be serviceable only by way of illustration. They are deceived with the Monk *Isidorus*, if they have determined that the *Latin Edition* is defective in all those places where they have inserted other interpretations; but they have shewn more judgement than he hath done, in regard that they have always preserved the ancient reading of the *Latin Text*, without making any alteration therein. Nevertheless, it will not be amiss to observe that these kinds of Bibles are dangerous; for under colour of correcting or illustrating the *Vulgar*, every party takes the liberty to annex thereto explications that are conformable to their own Sentiments; those which are in this Edition in *Quarto*, were taken from the Commentaries of *Lucas Oslander*. We may better judge of the Idea that these Protestant Divines have formed to themselves, by the express words of their Preface. *Ita ut (say they) infinitis fere locis genuina textus*

Præfat.

Bibl. Lat.
 edit. in 4.
 Tubia.
 ann. 1593.

redditio paraphraseos aut commentarii loco esse possit, sed & in disputationum exercitiis, quæ non in Academia modo, verum etiam inter Ministros hujus Ducatus frequenter instituuntur, hoc Bibliorum exemplar usum suum habebit. Expediit enim in dissolvendis objectionibus erit qui textus Biblici veterem illam versionem ab innumeris corruptelis vindicatam & repurgatam in promptu habebit. So that the genuin translation of the Text may serve in an almost infinite number of places instead of a Paraphrase or Commentary; and this Copy of the Bible may be of good use in polemical disputations, which are not only managed in the University, but also very often among the Ministers of this Duchy. For he will be more dextrous in resolving objections, who hath at hand that ancient Version of the Bible cleared and purged from innumerable corruptions.

This

This same Bible was published anno 1606. by *Andreas Osiander* with Notes; and he calls his Edition, *secundum Bibliorum glossatorum Editionem*. I have made use of the sixth Edition Printed at *Francfort in Folio* in the year 1635. Whereas the Glosses of the Catholick Writers were not favourable to the Protestants, their Divines have studied to exhibit others which they have adapted to their own opinions: The very Title of this Edition immediately discovers the design thereof; for they freely confess that they have suited their explications to the present state of their Church and to the model of their Divinity. *Multas* (say they in this Title) *insuper utilissimas observationes ex Patrum orthodoxorum & praestantissimorum quorundam nostri seculi Theologorum lucubrationibus, nec non ex formula concordiae excerptas, & ad praesentem Ecclesiae statum, potissimum vero ad disputationum Theologicarum utilissimum exercitium fideliter accommodatas continent.* It contains moreover many most useful observations collected out of the Works of the Orthodox Fathers, and of some of the most able Divines of our Age, as also out of a Book entituled *Formula concordiae*, and faithfully adapted to the present state of the Church, but chiefly to the most profitable exercise of Theological Disputations. Furthermore there is nothing in the Editions of the ancient *Latin* Translation published by these Protestants, that comes near to the Editions of *Robert Stephen* and to those of the *Lowvain* Divines; there is no proof found therein that makes it appear that they have studied the Criticisms of the Sacred Books; and they are proper only for the use of young Preachers, who are easily possessed with the opinions of their party: In a word, the greatest part of their Notes have respect to Divinity; and they have banished the various readings that might cause any scruple. Altho they have added a remark on the *I. Epistle of St. John* Chap. 5. v. 7. nevertheless they have not intimated to their Readers that this Verse is in very few of the *Greek* Copies, and that it is not written in the most ancient *Latin* Manuscripts, nor even in the *German* Version of their Patriarch *Luther*.

Andr.
Osiand.
Præf.
Bibl.
Latin.
edit. ann.
1606.

Bibl. Lat.
Andr.
Osiand.
in fol.
Francof.
anno.
1535.

()

C H A P. XII.

The Judgment of some Writers of these later times who have composed Critical Remarks on the various readings of the Latin Bibles, and principally on those of the New Testament. A vindication of the ancient Latin Interpreter by a learned Protestant.

I shall not here repeat what I have above related concerning the Bibles of Robert Stephen and of the Louvain Doctors, whose Margents are filled with various readings, which these able Critics have taken from the Manuscript Copies that they have perused. *Laurentius Valla* who died in the middle of the XV. Century, is the first among the *Latins* that applied himself in these later Times to this sort of Critical enquiries; he cites in his Remarks on the New Testament the various readings of many ancient *Latin Copies* which he had consulted. It was read, for example, in the 18th Chapter of *St. John's Gospel*, vers. 28. *ad Caiphā, to Caiphā* in our *Latin Edition* before it was reformed. *Valla* proves in his Note on this place, not only by the Authority of the *Greek Text*, but also by several good MSS. that it ought to be read *a Caipha, from Caiphas*: He reproves *St. Augustin* somewhat sharply who read *ad Caiphā*. *Hoc in Loco* (saith he) *incassum laborat Augustinus cruere sententiam contra Evangelii veritatem*. I shall discourse more at large elsewhere concerning the Observations of this Author on the New Testament, whose too severe Critical reflections procured him many Enemies, especially amongst the Divines, who could not endure that a Grammarian should prescribe Lessons to them.

If *Erasmus* had undertaken to publish the ancient *Latin Edition* of the New Testament with corrections, he would have performed it very accurately, having had in his Hands many very ancient and correct *Latin Manuscripts*, the names of which he sets down, and sometimes their qualifications in his Notes. But we shall insist thereon more at large in the third part of this History, when we shall have occasion to examin his Annotations on the New Testament.

Nicolaus Zegerus, a *Franciscan Friar*, hath purposely composed a Book relating to the various readings of the New Testament, wherein he magisterially determines touching those that ought to be admitted into our *Latin Edition*; since he imitated in this the Authors of the Writings called *Correctoria Biblia*, he gives (according to their Example) the name of *Epanorthotes*, or *Corrector to his Work*:
He

Laur.
Vall. An-
not. in
N. T. c.
18.
Joann. v.
28.

Tac. Nic.
Zege.
Castig. in
N. T. edit.
in 8. Co-
lon. ann.
1555.

He received much assistance from *Erasmus's* Notes; and in regard that he wrote in *Flanders*, he might easily review a considerable part of the Manuscripts that were used by this learned Critic: He likewise added some others that were very ancient, the names of which he declares in his Book: He doth not content himself simply to produce the various readings of his Copies, but he also lays down reasons to chuse the best, as may be above observed; nevertheless he hath not always good success in this choice: For he was much inclined to certain Opinions that sometimes lead him into Errors; and it is on this account that he hath too credulously believed, that the Decretal Epistles which were Printed in the 1. Tome of the Councils under the names of the primitive Popes, certainly belonged to them. He confirms the readings of our Vulgar by the citations of these Decretals, which he supposes to be very ancient, but they were written in the time when *St. Jerom's* Version was read in the Western Churches: He promiseth at the end of his Critical Enquiries (a) a new *Latin* Edition of the New Testament, with most exquisite Notes, which he intended to insert in the Margent, and wherein there should be nothing unprofitable. I do not believe that he hath published this Work, which would have been very acceptable, as proceeding from the Hand of a Man that had many excellent Manuscripts, and who seemed to take all the precautions necessary for the exact performance of such an Undertaking. He aspired above the other Critics or Correctors of the New Testament that have been before him, because he consulted better Manuscripts than they had done: He declares moreover (b) that the Books entituled *Castigatores*, which some judged to be very ancient, are not above three or four hundred years old, whereas he exhibits certain Copies that were written above eight and nine hundred years ago, as that of *Charles the Great*, and some others. But whatsoever antiquity he ascribes to his Manuscripts, those of *Erasmus* and *Robert Stephen* are not inferiour to his; and as for what concerns the Critical Art, these two Authors without doubt have had a better tincture thereof than he. He had no reason to blame *Erasmus*; for altho this learned Man had his particular notions, and fell into some er-

(a) Ipsa quam paramus Novi Testamenti editio, quo sit aliquanto futura gravior atque utilior, habitura est raras quasdam adnotatiunculas seu glossulas solis marginibus insertas; idque ubi omnino videbuntur ad aliquam verborum elucidationem necessaria, & quatenus patientur marginum capacitates. Zeger. peror. Castig. in N. T.

(b) Deprehendimus eos ipsos codices quos nonnulli Castigatores pro admodum antiquis habuere, vix ante annos trecentos aut quadringentos, & pures etiam eorum longo intervallo citra descriptos fuisse. — at vero que nos passim citamus nominatim exemplaria tam sunt vetusta, ut nonnulla descripta credantur ante annos octingentos aut noncentos, ne quid plus dicamus, veluti exemplar Evangelicum Caroli Magni, & exemplar item Evangelicum Guerefredi in Elst. ita ut nonnulla ob vetustatem vix legi potuerint Zeger. ibid,

rors, yet he well deserves to be excused, because he hath borrowed very little from any in this kind of study, nevertheless he hath attributed too much to his conjectures.

Zegerus in the same place makes mention of *Henricus Gravius* (c) who had a *Latin New Testament* ready to be put to the Press, with several various readings that were not observed by *Robert Stephen*: But if we may give credit to his Information, *Gravius* adhered too much to the *Greek* and to *Erasmus's* Notes, which obliged him to correct many things preposterously: If it be true that this Writer hath had too great a Deference to the Original *Greek*, it may be affirmed that *Zegerus* hath departed too far from it; for under pretence that the ancient *Latin* Edition ought to be established by good *Latin* Copies, he omits nothing in his Preface that tends to diminish the Authority of the *Greek* Text. And since this Preface contains divers considerable matters relating to the Critical reflections that are now in dispute, it will be convenient to examin them in particular, whereby the design and method of this Author will appear, who expected that his corrections should be received at the Court of *Rome* to serve as a rule in the reformation of the *Latin* Edition that was there intended to be made. He demonstrates (d) by too *Greek* Copies one of which was a Manuscript, and the other printed, that it is a great while since the *Greek* Text of the New Testament hath been full of alterations: This he endeavours to prove by these two Copies, because they are altogether defaced by the corrections that have been added therein; and he concludes from thence, that we can have no recourse at present to the *Greek*, as to the true Original; but if it be so, we ought also to disallow the most ancient *Latin* Copies that have been revised and corrected in divers places, as it hath been above shewn by many Examples. It is an easy matter to distinguish in the MSS. the Corrections from the Text; besides, it is not sufficient to rely on two or three Copies, but on a great number compared together. Nevertheless it must be confessed that there are very ancient alterations in the *Greek* Manuscripts that are not found in the *Latin*

(c) *Henricus Gravius* vir omni disciplinarum genere perpolitus, codicem suum, nihil obstante quod editionis esset *Roberti Stephani*, studiosissime castigavit — Verum nos tandem, eundem nati codicem deprehendimus ipsum plus æquo fuisse castigacionibus *Erasmicis* & editioni *Græcæ*, nullis consultis scriptoribus antiquis, eoque multa castigasse sinistre & præpostere. Zeger. *ibid.*

(d) Duo ipsi vidimus exemplaria *Græca*, quæ palam arguunt quantum pridem in lectione *Græca* fuerit corruptela. Alterum servatur in *Cænobio Regularium Corsendocensi* descriptum calamo; alterum in celebri *Academia Lovaniensi* apud ejusdem instituti Religiosos in *Cænobio D. Martini* expressum typis. Quod cernentibus innumera ostentat correctoris cujusdam nempe *Desiderii*, si recte memini, vestigia. Hinc palam liquet quam agant præpostere qui hodie pro tuenda lectionis veritate, non alio confugiendum autumant quam ad editionem *Græcam*. Zeger. Prolog. Castig. in N. T.

Copies ; but there are also some of them in these last which are not expressed in the former ; it is therefore necessary to examin these variations according to the Critical Rules. If the *Greek* Copies were absolutely rejected, because they have been altered by some Revisers, no New Testament ought to be any longer approved in whatsoever Language it be written ; for this hath been the common fate of MSS. Books to be revised and corrected by Critics.

The Authority of St. *Jerom*, which *Zegerus* alledges as a proof that our *Latin* Edition should be preferred before the *Greek*, is not very much to the purpose, since this Father asserts in divers passages of his Works, that Water is purer at the Spring-head than in the Channels, and calls the *Greek* Text *Græca veritas*, when he compares it with the *Latin* Version : Moreover it is certain that this learned Critic hath revised the ancient *Latin* Edition by the *Greek* Copies. But St. *Jerom* (say they) hath reprehended many things in the *Latin* Translations of his time which are found at this day in the *Greek* ; and therefore this *Greek* is neither pure nor exact. This proves only that there are various readings in the *Greek* Copies ; and forasmuch as St. *Jerom* was not infallible in the choice that he made of them, we ought to judge of these different readings according to the ordinary Rules of the Art of Critic ; and it cannot be inferred from thence, that the *Latin* must always be esteemed above the *Greek*.

Furthermore, there is less weight in another Argument subjoined by *Zegerus* in the same place, which is taken from hence (e) That very few had any knowledge of the *Greek* tongue in the Church of *Rome* during eight or nine hundred years ; whereupon he affirms, that it could not happen otherwise but in those times of ignorance a great number of errors must of necessity have crept into the *Greek* Copies, since many have likewise accrewed to the *Latin*, among those who understood that Language. A strange sort of Inference ! Have not the *Grecians* preserved their Copies amongst themselves ? And must we needs argue with respect to the Western Churches that were ignorant of the *Greek* Tongue for so many Ages ? There is no necessity of proceeding to these extremities to prove that the present *Greek* Text is not a certain Rule, which ought always to be followed, as some have pretended, if the Maxim of St. *Jerom*, who avouches that which varies cannot be true, *verum non esse quod variat*, is of any force. We might also reject the *Latin* for the same reason, because it differs after the same manner of the

Hieron.
Præf. in
IV. Eu-
ang. ad
Dam.

(e) *Ad hæc cum multis retro seculis, nimirum annis circiter octingentis aut nongentis, lingua Græca ab Ecclesia Romana prorsus fere exularit, ita ut nonnisi tenuis ac rara apud paucos quosdam hujus remanserit lingue peritia, quis credat nullos interim irrepisse errores ? Et si tot modis temporis nihil non viriantis progressu adulterata fuit Editio Latina inter Latinos, quidni idem credendum est usu venisse inter eosdem Editioni Græcæ ?* Zeg. Prolog. Castig. in N. T.

()
Greek: This Father himself hath urged this Maxim against those of his time, who should not consent that the Old *Latin* Edition should be corrected by the *Greek* Copies.

This Author forgets not to object to diminish the authority of the *Greek* Copies, that the *Greek* Church doth not agree with the *Latin* in some Articles of Faith: *Sileo* (says he) *illorum a nobis in dogmatis nonnullis fidei dissensionem*. He opposes (f) the Heresies of this Church, and proves by the example of *Marcion*, that the *Greek* hath been corrupted on purpose in many places, some of which he describes. But these kinds of Objections have been thoroughly examined in the first part of this History, where we have shewn that the Heretics are accused without reason of corrupting the Books of the New Testament, except some few that deserve not the name of Christians: Moreover the *Greek* Copies are not to be sought for amongst the *Marcionites*, but the *Orthodox*. He argues much better, when he produces as an example of this alteration, the History of the adulterous Woman, which is extant in all our *Latin* Copies in the 8. Chapter of *St. John's* Gospel; whereas it was not written heretofore in several *Greek* Manuscripts, nor even in the Works of *St. Chrysostom*. This indeed plainly shews that we ought not absolutely to rely on the *Greek*, and that the *Latin* is sometimes more faithful; and on this account it is that *Zegerus* had just cause to vindicate the authority of our *Latin* Editions against those that rejected it, under pretence that it doth not always agree with the *Greek* Original: But as he himself confesses, the *Greek* Text ought not to be altogether laid aside, tho it hath been altered in many passages, and those alterations are very ancient. Moreover, he is obliged to acknowledge that our Version is full of faults, that several additions have been inserted therein, and that it hath been mutilated in some places: *Hac ipsa Versio* (faith he) *multis in locis nescitur vitata, mutilata & aucta*. Therefore (g) he undertook in his Work to distinguish the true readings from the false, and to support his corrections by solid proofs; but whatsoever pains he hath taken, it is certain that he is often deceived, as it might be easily demonstrated by many Examples.

Franciscus Lucas Brugenfis a Divine of *Louvain*, hath published a Critical Work of the same nature, on the whole Bible, in which he often quotes that of *Zegerus*. This Book being intituled, *Notationes in Sacra Biblia, quibus variantia discrepantibus loca exemplaribus loca summo studio discutuntur*, was composed on purpose to be annexed to the Bible of the *Louvain*

Not. Fr.
 Luc. Brug.
 in Bibl.
 edit. ant.
 ann. 1580.

(f) *Ubi perfidia cepit grassari heretica cepit simul & quorundam temeritudo vel sacrosancta violare divinarum litterarum oracula, ut quod persuadere haud poterat sapientia, seu verius malitia humana, mentita adstrueret auctoritas divina.* Zeger. *ibid*.

(g) *Quia tanta est unius Novi Testamenti in lectione ac verbis varietas, non abs re fore putavi, si solidis testimoniis reprobarem atque firmarem, quae sint habenda pro genuinis atque indubitat.* Zeger. *ibid*.

Divines,

Divines, who added (as I have already observed) at the end of the first Edition of their Bible, certain Annotations to serve as an illustration of divers places, which they could not sufficiently explain in the little Notes that are in the Margent. *Lucas Brugensis* was ordered to perform this task, and to make larger remarks on the various readings, who acquitted himself therein as a learned Man and an expert Critic. To this end he consulted several *Latin* Copies, the names and qualifications of which may be seen in the beginning of his Book. He likewise had recourse to the Originals themselves, and to some Oriental Versions, that he might better judge of the readings which ought to be retained in our *Latin* Version ; so that his Work is the most exact of any that we have on this subject.

In the first place he gives an account of his design in an Epistle dedicated to Cardinal *Sirlet*, in which he presupposes, as a certain matter of fact, that if there are various readings in the Originals of the Bible, as it cannot be doubted, the same may happen much more in the Versions. *Id cum in ipso fonte acciderit* (says he speaking of these variations) *perspicuum est enim in Novo Testamento Græco - longe magis in translatione accidisse potuit.* He accounts (*h*) as ridiculous the objection of those who affirm that the Council of *Trent* having declared the ancient *Latin* Edition to be authentick, it is no longer necessary to correct it ; he asserts, on the contrary, that it stood in need of a reformation, since the Council hath not proposed any Copy in particular to be used by all persons, but only intended that the Vulgar should be preferred before all the other *Latin* Editions. He declares moreover, that they that apply themselves to collect the various readings of the *Latin* Copies of the ancient Translation, in order to establish those that are true and genuin, do thereby obey the Orders of this Council, which hath required that the Vulgar should be printed as correctly as possibly it could. *Qui ex variis ipsius veteris Editionis* Burgibid. *exemplaribus illi emendanda & primæva lectioni germanæque interpretis Scriptura restituenda operam navet, tantum abest ut menti Synodi adversetur, ut ipsa ad hoc Synodo hortante ex mente Synodi faciat, statuit enim, ut hæc ipsa vetus & Vulgata Editio quam emendatissime imprimatur.*

(*h*) Quod nobis objectant alii, cum vetus Editio *Latina* a Tridentino Concilio probata atque authentica pronunciata sit, nulla amplius opus esse castigatione, ridiculum prorsus est. Neque enim Concilium Editionis hujus exemplaria erratorum expertia esse judicavit, neque etiam certum aliquod Editionis exemplar sequendum omnibus proposuit, sed Editionem ipsam ceteris quæcunque extant *Latinis* Editionibus præulit, & authenticam definivit. Luc. Brug. Epist. ad Card. Sirlet.

Lastly, this learned Critic (i) did not believe that a good choice could be made amongst an infinite number of various readings, which are found in the *Latin* Manuscripts, without consulting the Originals, because there will always arise some doubts, till application is made to them, and even to the Versions that have been written in other languages: In a word, there is nothing omitted in his Critical Reflections that may serve to re-establish our *Latin* Version; and altho his Work was finished before the Corrections of *Sixtus V.* and *Clement VIII.* nevertheless I am perswaded that our Edition might still be reformed by his Observations: However, there are some passages which are not very exact, particularly where he follows *Zegerus*: This he doth, when he authorizeth certain readings of the New Testament by the Decretal Epistles that we published under the names of the first Popes: This without doubt would be a very material circumstance in favour of our *Vulgar*, if these Epistles were certainly written by these ancient Bishops of *Rome*; but all people agree at this day that they were forged in those times, when *St. Jerom's* new Edition was received in the Western Churches. This Critic composed his Work (as hath been already observed) before the Censors of *Rome* had brought their Edition of the *Vulgar* to perfection, and set forth another concerning their Corrections some time after that the *Latin* Bible was corrected by *Clement VIII.* This Book is entituled *Romana Correctionis in Latinis Bibliis Editionis Vulgata jussu Sixti V. Pontificis Maximi recognitis loca insigniora observata a Fr. Luca Brugensi.* It ought to be added in the Title, & *Clementis VIII.* as it is in the Preface. Altho his intention in this little Work was only to prevent the reprinting of the *Vulgar* with its ancient faults; nevertheless he forbore not to intermix therein certain judicious reflections on the Corrections of the *Roman* Censors, which he seems not to approve in every particular.

In Octav.
Antverp.
ann. 1608.

Vet. Interp. cum
Beza aliis
que recent.
Collatio in
IV. Evan.
& Apost.

(i) Qui solam adfert *Latinorum* exemplarium variationem, nihil nisi scrupum injicit lectoris animo. Hæret enim animi dubius quid amplectatur, donec aut ex fontibus, aut ex antiquis aliarum linguarum editionibus, aut ex tractatorum commentariis, aut ex locorum circumstantiis, aut ex ipsa exemplarium spectata integritate, aut denique ex his simulationibus, quod inter exemplaria ipsa discernat, afferatur. Brug. ibid.

the

the *English*, appears in this, that they have a veneration for the ancient interpretation of the Church, notwithstanding this great quantity of modern Translations of the New Testament that have been made in these later times. The Work of this Learned Canon hath been very much approved by Bishop Walton, who hath commended it in these words, Ut Vulgatam contra Erasmus defendit Beza; sic eundem contra Bezæ censuras sæpe injustas justo volumine tuetur Johannes Boys nuper Præbendarius Ecclesiæ Eliensis, idque hortatu Reverendi & longe doctissimi Præsulis D. Lanceloti Andrews tunc Eliensis, postea Wintoniensis Antistitis dignissimi, qui hoc onus ipsi imposuit. I shall take an occasion to discourse thereof more at large in the sequel of this History.

Walt.
Bibl. Po-
lygl. Pro-
leg. X. de
Vulg.
Vers.

C H A P. XIII.

Of the Syriac Version of the New Testament, and its antiquity. Some things are wanting in the best Syriac Copies, which are found in the Greek and Latin.

THE Syrian Churches are divided into three Sects, viz. Nestorians, Jacobites and Maronites; or rather, only into two; for the Maronites were not in the beginning distinguished from the Jacobites; the largest of all is that of the Nestorians, who are dispersed as far as the Indies, and have been heretofore in China. These Nations, notwithstanding their difference in opinions, as to several matters of Religion, do not forbear to make use of one and the same Syriac Version of the New Testament; and altho they have not for a very long time understood the ancient Syriac Tongue, nevertheless they always continue to read the Sacred Books and their Liturgies in that language. The time when this Version was made by the Syrians, cannot be exactly determined; some Authors refer it even to the Apostolick; but there are no solid proofs to confirm this great antiquity; and we may justly account as fabulous what Guido Fabritius Boderensis relates after William Postel, who attributes their Translation of the New Testament to St. Mark. (a) It

(a) Quando & a quo sacer iste codex in Syrum sermonem versus sit, nullius auctoris testimonio, saltem quem legerim, demonstrari potest. Syri tamen a quibus eum habemus constanter asserunt S. Marcum, S. Petri Apostolorum Coriphei discipulum, & in cujus domo initio coaluisse Ecclesiam credunt plurimi, Latine primum scripsisse Evangelium suum, quod etiamnum asserunt dicunt in inclita Venetorum urbe. Deinde eundem ipsum Marcum lingua patria, hoc est Galilæa Syra, non modo Evangelium suum transtulisse, sed etiam ceteros omnes Novi Testamenti libros. Id mihi literis significavit Guilielmus Postellus, affirmavitque se ita a Syris ipsis accepisse. Guido Fabr. Boder. Præf. N. T. Syr. to. 5. Bibl. Reg.

cannot be proved (saith this Author) by the Testimony of any Writer, at least, that I have read, when, and by whom the New Testament was translated into the Syriac Tongue. The Syrians, nevertheless, from whom we receive it, do unanimously assert, that St. Mark, the Disciple of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, in whose House many believe that the Church assembled together in those Primitive Times, wrote his Gospel at first in Latin, which is yet preserved (as they say) even at this day in the famous City of Venice; and that he afterwards translated into his own Galilean or Syrian Language, not only his Gospel, but also all the other Books of the New Testament. William Postel hath imparted this to me in his Letters, who affirms that he was informed thereof by the Syrians themselves.

I am apt to believe that W. Postel, who hath been elsewhere a great Impostor, hath received this intelligence from the Syrians: But there are such signal marks of weakness in the Writings of those of this Nation, when they treat of this matter, that no credit can be given to them: They affirm, for example, that St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans in Latin, and many other things of the like nature that are read in their Manuscript Copies of the New Testament. It is to be admired that Guido Boderensis, who understood the Oriental Languages, should take pleasure in giving out these Fables. Moreover the Galilean Tongue was different from the Syriac that is now disputed. It is true indeed, that the Language which was spoken by the Apostles, is called Syriac by the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, and even by the most learned men of this Age; nevertheless it ought not to be confounded with the Syriac of the New Testament, as Boderensis hath done, when he declares, in speaking of this last Syriac, (b) that it was the Mother Tongue of the Apostles; that they made use of it in their private discourses, and in their publick Sermons when they instructed the Jews; and besides, that this Language was preserved entire from their times to ours in all the Churches of Asia. Altho there is but little difference between the Chaldaic Tongue, which was spoken in the time of our Saviour and of the Apostles throughout all Judea, and that which is properly termed Syriac; nevertheless it is perceived by those that understand both Languages, the former was only retained in the Synagogues of the Jews, and by the Christians named Nazarenes, as it may be seen in the first part of this Critical History.

(b) Quo (sermone Syro) tanquam materno & vulgari omnes Apostoli usi sunt tum in privatis colloquiis, tum in publicis concionibus, quoties Judaicam plebem sunt allocuti, quod ab eorum temporibus usque ad nostram aetatem in omnibus Ecclesiis Christianorum totius Asiae incorrupte aservatum & custoditum fuit. Boder, ibid.

Tremellius who hath published a *Syriac* Edition of the New Testament, confesses likewise (c) that it cannot be determined by whom it was translated out of *Greek* into *Syriac*, nor in what time; he onely conjectures that this was done in that of the Apostles or of their Disciples; unless perhaps it might be suspected that they would have had more regard in their Writings to foreign Nations than to their own Countrey; but this Argument is erroneous in this particular, that it supposes that the *Syriac* New Testament was written in the Language of the *Jews* of those times, which nevertheless is not true. The Author of the Preface prefixed to *Trostius's* *Syriac* Edition of the New Testament (d) extolls this Version as the most ancient and most exact of all the Translations of the New Testament: He judgeth that it was made by one of the Evangelists, or at least by some person who had seen the Apostles at *Antioch*, and consulted them thereupon; from whence he concludes, that we ought to have recourse to that alone, when any difficulties occur that cannot be resolved by the *Greek* Original. But although this Translation is very ancient, it cannot be proved by any solid reasons, that it was extant before the *Italic* of the *Latin* Church, it is merely a supposition to affirm that some Evangelist or Christian of *Antioch* who lived in the time of the Apostles is the Author thereof; for the *Greek* Tongue was then spoken in that great City. That which is most certain is, that it may justly claim a very great antiquity; and that it preceeded all those Schisms which afterwards divided the Eastern Nations into different Sects; and this is the cause that they all equally esteem it; If we may in any manner rely on conjecture, it is probable that this Version was composed by the *Syrians* inhabiting beyond the river *Euphrates*; who having no dependance on the *Roman* Empire, spake onely the *Syriac* tongue, wherefore they were obliged to translate the Sacred Books into their own Language, that they might be read and understood by the People.

Tremell in
Epist. De-
dic. N. T.
Syr. ad Re-
gin. Eliz.

Jac. Mart.
Præfat. in
N. T. Syr.
Trost.

(c) *Quemadmodum igitur ab Apostolorum temporibus editæ Versiones aliæ; sic quoque Syriaca nostra si non fortè tota, majori tamen ex parte ex Archetypo Græco fidelissimè expressa est. Sed quo vel quibus auctoribus; quo item tempore, cum id nusquam inquirantibus nobis adhuc occurrerit, non magis definiri potest, quàm Græca Veteris Testamenti & vetus Latina quibus auctoribus verè sit adscribenda. Interim veritati prorsus est consentaneum intra ipsa Ecclesiæ Christi initia vel ab Apostolis ipsis vel eorum discipulis profectam esse, nisi fortè suspicari malumus eos scribendo alienigenarum duntaxat rationem habere voluisse, suorum autem gentilium aut nullam aut certè perquam exiguam.* Imman. Trem. in Epist. Dedic. N. T. Syr. ad Regin. Elizab.

(d) *Versio est hæc Syra, sed omnium prima & antiquissima; Versio est, inquam, sed omnibus aliis ut probatior & plenior præferenda. Versio est, adhuc dico, sed vel alicujus ex Evangelistis, vel omnino illorum qui Antiochiæ habuerunt ipsos Apostolos præsentis, quos de locis multis consulere & audire potuerunt. Ad hanc itaque solam, quando in fontibus Græcis quedam occurrit obscuritas vel difficultas, tuto acceditur. Hæc sola, quando de loci alicujus Interpretatione versioneque dubium movetur, tuto ac sine errore consulitur. Per hanc solam Græcus Textus verè illustratur ac rectè intelligitur.* Jacob. Mart. Præf. in N. T. Syr. Trost.

Some Critics have affirmed that it is not so ancient as it is generally believed, because certain Glosses are found therein which could not be added in the most ancient Greek Copies: Now since it is not doubted but that it was made from the Greek, they thereupon conclude that it cannot be imputed to any other time but that when the Greek Text was altered by those Glosses. This reason is alledged by Grotius in his Notes on the 6th Chapter of St. Matthew, verse 13. where it is read in the Syriac, as well as in the present Greek, *For thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, for ever*: (e) These words being taken from the Liturgies of the Grecians, this Critic inferrs from thence, that the Syriac, the Latin, and the Arabic Versions, in which they are expressed were composed since the Greek Liturgy was reduced into a certain form.

But there can be no Argument weaker than this; for it is certain that this Gloss is not read in the most part of the Latin Copies, nor even in the most correct and most ancient; it is not in the old Edition that was used before the time of St. Jerom, nor in the new: if it is found in some Manuscripts, it hath been added therein from the Greek, by the Revisers of those MSS. why may not the same thing be affirmed of the Syriac Version, which might be revised in that place conformably to the Greek Copies in which this Addition was inserted? Moreover it is worth the observing, that the different Sects of the Syrian Nations have every one of them their respective Liturgies in the Syriac tongue which were translated from the Greek: now since these Translations were made in a time when the Greek Liturgies had this Gloss, it was also found in the Syriac, from whence it might easily pass into the Syriac New Testament which was read in the Churches as well as the Liturgy. As for the Arabic Version, Grotius hath not considered that it was not taken from the Greek, but from the Syriac; and therefore it is no wonder to see this Addition both in one and in the other.

Mr. Vossius affirms also that the Syriac Version of the New Testament is modern, because there are certain Latin words found therein which are of the later times, as that of קִשְׁטוֹנְרִי, *questionaries*, in the 27th Chapter of St. Matthew, verse 65. In Novo Testamento (says he) etiam infimæ Latinitatis reperiuntur vocabula, quale est quod occurrit Matt. 27. v. 65. Grotius had already made this remark after Fullerus, whence he hath also concluded, that the Syriac Translation is not so ancient as the Syrians imagine, Unde etiam apparet non tam antiquam esse hunc interpretationem quam Syri credunt.

If. Voss. de
Translat.
Sept. In-
terp. c. 28.

Grot. An-
not. ad
cap. 27.
Matt. v. 65.

(e) Quod sequitur, quoniam tuum est regnum, &c. cum in vetustissimis exemplaribus Græcis non extiterit; extet autem in Syriaco & in Latino contextu & in Arabico, argumentum nobis exhibet, unde discamus non Arabicam tantum & Latinam versionem, sed & Syriacam factam postquam Ecclesiarum Aethiopia formam certam acceperat. Grot. Annot. ad c. 6. Matt. v. 13.

I admire that *Fullerus* and *Grotius*, who were able Critics, have not perceived that there was in this place an apparent fault of the Copier in the *Syriac* Edition of *Widmanstadius*, which hath been followed by many others; it ought to be read as it is in the *Polyglott Bible* of *England*, קסטונר, with the Letter *d*, which answers to the *Latin* word *grecoized*, *καστοδία* that is in the *Greek*. *Gabriel Sionita* had in his *Syriac* Copy, ܩܫܬܘܢܪ *custodes*, as I have likewise read in a *Syriac* Manuscript which is in the *King's Library*. If *Grotius* had made this reflexion, he would not have asserted, that this Interpreter hath not sufficiently expressed the sense of the *Greek* word, (*sententiam non satis expressit*) 285. in translating it by *questionarius*. Cod. MS. IV. Evang. Syr. ex Bib. Reg. n. 285.

However *Mr. Vossius* alledges no other reason but this to prove the *Syriac* Version to be of a later date, and after having produced other examples against the *Syriac* Translation of the *Old Testament*, he concludes, that both contain barbarous and foreign words. *Si quis* (says this learned man) *diligenter Versionem de qua sermo est velit excutere, plurimas hujus generis exoticas voces offendet*. I could averr on the contrary, that he hath not diligently enquired into this matter, or rather, he seems not to have understood it. The most material example that he hath exhibited of those barbarous words (*f*) is that of ܐܪܝܬܐ, or ܐܪܝܬܐ, which is found in the 13th Chapter of *Genesis*, verse 2. and in several other places to signify Silver; He declares that it was taken from the *Greek* word ἀργυρον, or ἀργυρον, which is onely used by the modern *Grecians*, whence he infers that this *Syriac* Version is very new: but he will never be able to demonstrate that this *Chaldaic* or *Syriac* word was taken from the *Vulgar Greek* ἀργυρον. they that have any knowlege of this Language, understand that it comes from the Verb ܐܪܝܬܐ, which signifies to put or hide, from whence was formed ܐܪܝܬܐ, *silver*, because Silver is commonly lockt up. The *Arabians* do likewise make use of the word ܐܪܝܬܐ in the like signification, which derives its original from the same Verb. If. Vossib. Ibid.

It may be observed that many things are not found in the most ancient *Syriac* Copies of the *New Testament*, that are at present in the *Greek* and *Latin*, in which circumstances these *Syriac* Manuscripts agree with the Editions of *Widmanstadius*, *Plantin*, *Tremellius* and *Trostius*. There are in the *King's Library* two *Syriac* Manuscripts of the *Gospels*, and another written in *Babylonian* Characters, which contains the whole *New Testament*, except some of the *Catholick Epistles* and the *Revelation*. The history of the adulterous woman, which is comprised in eleven Verses, and is read in all our *Latin* Copies, and in the most part of Codd. MSS. Syr. ex Bib. Reg. nn. 285, 286, 284.

(f) Ex eo præcipuè colligi potest, Syriacam istam translationem admodum esse recentem, quod Genes. 13. vers. 2. & passim alibi ܐܪܝܬܐ & ܐܪܝܬܐ pro argento accipiatur, nempe quia Græci posteriores metallum hoc ἀργυρον, vel ἀργυρον, adpellant. If. Voss. de Transl. Sept. Interp. c. 28.

Cod. MS.
yr. Bibl.
Colb. n.
1497.

the *Greek*, is not written in any of those Manuscripts; nevertheless there is one that is very new, and which hath been copied out at *Rome* by a *Maronite* in the year 1521. Neither have I read this history in an excellent *Syriac* Manuscript of the IV. Gospels written in *Nestorian* or *Babylonish* Characters which remains in M. Colbert's Library: This causeth me to judge that it was not in the *Greek* Copies from which the *Syriac* Translation was composed. The *English* have supplied it in their Edition of the Polyglot Bible from a Manuscript of Bishop *Usher*. *Gutbirius* hath also inserted it in his Edition; but it would have been more convenient (in my opinion) to add it simply in form of a Note, than to put it into the *Syriac* Text, since it is not in the most ancient Manuscripts, nor even in a Manuscript which was transcribed at *Rome* by a *Maronite*, for the use of the Cardinal of *Placentia*, named *Bernardinus Lupus de Carvajal*.

We may argue after the same manner concerning the 7th Verse of the 5th Chapter of the 1st Epistle of St. *John*, where mention is made of the testimony of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, which is not expressed in any of the *Syriac* MSS. that I have consulted, nor in any Edition, except that of *Gutbirius*, who hath indiscreetly added it therein, contrary to the Authority of all the *Syriac* Copies. *Tremellius* is the first that hath translated this passage out of *Greek* into *Syriac*; but he durst not annex it to the Text of his Edition; he hath contented himself to place it in the Margent by way of Supplement; he acknowledges likewise, that he found it not in a *Syriac* Manuscript of the Library of *Heidelberg*. *Quia* (says he) *non modo in impresso, sed etiam in manuscripto codice Heidelbergensi omittebatur, nec in omnibus vetustis codicibus Græcis legebatur, textui inferere non sum ausus*. He hath renpred it thus, ותלתא אנון הסדרין בשמיהא אבא מלתא ורוחא קדישא ותלתהון חר אנון; which answers to the ordinary *Greek*, and to our *Latin* Edition. *Gutbirius* who set forth a New Edition of the *Syriac* New Testament in very fair Characters, proceeded farther; for he hath joyned to the Text that which *Tremellius* onely set down in the Margent of his Edition, declaring at the same time, that it was after his manner; moreover he hath added an observation on this place, that might induce one to believe that hath not seen the *Syriac* Edition of *Tremellius*; that this Writer had found it in some Manuscript though he himself hath assured us to the contrary. *Cum notum sit* (saith *Gutbirius*) *Arianos nec ipsi Græco Textui, nec Versionibus Orientalibus hic pepercisse, ex notis Tremellii hunc versum in aliis editionibus desideratum restituimus*. Since it is known, that the *Arians* have not here spared neither the *Greek* Text it self nor the *Oriental* Versions, we have thought fit to restore this verse, which is wanting in other editions out of *Tremellius's* notes. However, it was not necessary to condemn the *Arians* for corrupting the *Greek* Original and the *Oriental* Versions in this passage; for it hath been shewn in the first part of this Critical History, that they that charge them with leaving out of the *Greek*

Greek Copies the testimony of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, have not done them justice in this particular; but this Protestant could produce no better reasons to justify the addition which he inserted in his *Syriac* Copy of the New Testament contrary to the authority of all the other Editions.

There are much more considerable matters than these that we have lately observed which are omitted in the best Copies of the *Syriac* New Testament: for we find but three Canonical Epistles, viz. that of Saint James, the first of S. Peter, and the first of S. John; the others are not contained therein, nor even the *Revelation*. The Copy in the King's Library comprehending the whole New Testament written in *Babylonian* Characters, which the *Nestorians* more frequently use than the other Sects of the *Syrian* Nation, includes no other Books but those that are now specified; the three Catholic Epistles are annexed to the *Acts of the Apostles*, and after these the Epistles of St. Paul follow in the same Volume. There is extant also a Manuscript in Mr. Colbert's Library which comprises in one single Volume and in the same order the *Acts of the Apostles*, the three Catholic Epistles above mentioned, and the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul; but the other Epistles, and the *Revelation*, are left out; nevertheless the Volume is complete: There is another *Syriac* Manuscript in this same Library which is in all respects like unto this. *Widmanstadius* and others who have set forth *Syriac* Editions of the New Testament after him, have likewise found in their MSS. but three Catholic Epistles, neither is the *Revelation* written therein.

Mr. Pocock is the first that hath published these four Catholic Epistles in *Syriac* from a Manuscript of England, in which he found them joined with the others: He declares (g) that he knows not when, nor by whom they were translated into the *Syriac* tongue, and onely cites a *Syrian* Author called *Dionysius*, who hath written a Commentary on all the Canonical Epistles, the *Acts of the Apostles*, and the *Revelation*, and in imitates in his Preface to the Second of St. Peter, that it was not translated into *Syriac* in the beginning with the other Books of the New Testament, and that therefore it is onely in the Version of one *Thomas* a Bishop, surnamed of *Heraclea*, from the name of his City. This learned man hath caused the Text of these Epistles to be printed in *Syriac* and *Hebrew* Characters in imitation of the *Syriac* which is in the Royal Bible of Philip II.

(g) A quo aut quando in linguam Syriacam translata sint hæ Epistolæ, supra vires meas disquisitio est. Unum tamen monere liceat, Dionysium quendam, qui Commentarius Syris hæc unâ cum cæteris Canonicis & Actis Apostolorum necnon Apocalypsi illustravit, in præfatione ad secundam Petri monere Epistolam II. Petri non fuisse versam in linguam Syriam cum libris qui diebus antiquis redditi sunt, ideoque non inveniri nisi in translatione Thomæ Episcopi qui cognominatus est Heracleæ civitatis sue. Edvard. Pocock. Præfat. in Epist. IV. Cath. Syr.

At Leyden an. 1627. Ludovicus de Dieu had already brought to light the *Revelation* in Syriac by the means of a Manuscript preserved in the Library of the the University of *Leyden*, which formerly belonged to *Scaliger*. He observes in his Preface, that it was taken from the *Greek*, (h) because the Author translates even the *Greek* Articles δ , η , $\tau\delta$. Nevertheless it is certain that the *Syrians* want this Article, and that the *Hebrews* express it very well by their Letter \aleph . He after substitutes in its place the Pronoun ܐܢܝܝܐ which answers rather to the Pronouns ἐγὼ & $\alphaὐτός$ of the *Grecians*, than to their Articles δ , η , $\tau\delta$. This causeth me to suspect that this Translation of the *Revelation* was made by some *European*, though *Ludovicus de Dieu* pretends that he perceived by the Writing the hand of a *Syrian* and even of a *Maronite*: But the name of *Casspar* which this man assumes to himself seems rather to appertain to an *European* than a *Maronite*; and he leaves us to guess the place where he was born, when he adds these words $\text{ܠܝܗܘܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ}$

(h) Unde factum ut cum Syri articulo emphatico careant qui Græcorum articulo præpositivo δ , η , $\tau\delta$, respondeat, quem Hebræi per suum \aleph exprimunt felicissime, hic noster potius quam ut emphasim articuli Græci omiserit, pronomem tertia persone ܐܢܝܝܐ passim substituerit, quæ alioqui propriè valent ἐγὼ vel $\alphaὐτός$. In quo quidem noster hic libellus longè luxuriat magis quam qui antebac è Novo Testamento editi fuerunt. Lud. de Dieu Præfat. in Apoc. Syr. edit. Lugd. Batav. ann. 1627.

C H A P. XIV.

Of the Order of the MSS. Copies of the Syriac New Testament, and of the different Editions of them that have been published.

THE Publishers of the Catalogue of the Oriental MSS. Books that are kept in the Library of the Duke of *Florence*, have described two *Syriac* Manuscripts of the Gospels, one of which is above a thousand years old, and the other is not much less ancient: There is none in the *King's Library* nor in that of *Mr. Colbert* which comes near this antiquity; for of three Manuscripts that are in his Majesties possession, there are two very new, and they contain onely the Gospels; the other in which the whole New Testament is included after the above mentioned manner is not above five hundred years old; neither do the most ancient of *Mr. Colbert's* exceed this time, and amongst four Copies that belong to him there is one very lately written which comprehends the *Acts of the Apostles*, the three Canonical Epistles, and the fourteen Epistles of *St. Paul*. The Order of the Books of the New Testament in the

the MSS. Copies is different from that in the printed ; for the Canonical Epistles , which are onely three in number , precede those of Saint Paul, so that the whole New Testament in those MSS. is divided into three parts, in the first whereof are comprised the four Gospels ; in the second *the Acts of the Apostles* and these three Canonical Epistles ; and in the third, the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, which are placed after the same method as we see them at present in our Copies. The whole Book is subdivided into several Distinctions of Lessons that are read in the Churches throughout all the parts of the year, and this is the cause that we find at the beginning of the respective Sections or Chapters almost in all the *Syriac* Manuscripts the Index of the Lessons belonging to every day, which hath been taken from their *Lectiary* that is compendiously annexed at the beginning or at the end of those MSS. after the same manner as the *Synaxarion* in the *Greek* Manuscripts of the New Testament.

I shall not spend time in giving a particular account of all these Rubrics, because they are to be seen in the most part of the printed *Syriac* New Testaments ; as for example, the first Lesson is intituled, *The Sunday before Christmaß-day* ; the second, *The Revelation of Joseph* ; and so of the others. There is indeed some difference in the Manuscripts as well with respect to the number of these Rubrics, as to certain words, but it is so inconsiderable, that it ought not to be regarded. These Titles are generally written in red letters in the MSS. Copies, to distinguish them from the Text, and in some they are expressed in the margin, therefore they are properly inserted in the printed Books in the form of a Title. There is one Manuscript of the four Gospels in Mr. *Colbert's* Library, in which these Rubrics are not found ; the Copier whereof hath contented himself onely to put in the margin the number of the Lessons or Sections that are distinguished by the Letters of the Alphabet, which is sufficient, because there is usually added at the beginning or at the end of the *Syriac* Manuscripts, a Table of the Lessons of the whole year, which refers to those numbers marked in the margin by the aforesaid letters ; this method is observed in all the other parts of the *Syriac* New Testament, in the same manner as in the Gospels ; the Transcribers, for example, have prefixed to one of Mr. *Colbert's* Manuscripts that contains the Acts and the three Canonical Epistles, a Table of the Lessons of every day, which are also expressed in the Text in their proper places, and in red letters, in form of a Rubric : All these Sections may be seen in the printed Books, but this property is peculiar to the Manuscripts that since *The Acts of the Apostles* and the three Canonical Epistles compose but one single part of the New Testament, viz. the second, the number of their Sections is continued after the *Acts* thus, whereas the *Acts* contain 69, the I. Epist. of S. *James* is marked 70, and others follow the same rule ; so that the last Section of this second part ending at the I. Epist. of St. *John* is inscribed n. 88.

Hence

Cod. MS.
Syr. ex
Bibl. Colbert.
n. 4853.

Hence it may be proved, that the *Syrians* do not read in their Churches the four other Catholic Epistles, nor the *Revelation*, in regard that those Books are not in their *Lectiary* or *Synaxarion*; and it is for this reason that in Mr. *Colbert's* Manuscript above cited those words written in *Syriac* at the end of the Epistle of St. *John*: *Here ends the Epistle of the Apostle St. John, and the fourteen Epistles of the Apostle St. Paul follow.* Therefore the Lessons that are specified in the Edition of these last Canonical Epistles in the Polyglott Bible of *London* must of necessity have been taken from some *Lectiary* of a later date. Lastly, Forasmuch as the fourteen Epistles of St. *Paul* do likewise compose but one part of the New Testament, according to the division of the *Syrians*; the Lessons or Sections are therein described without any separation of the distinct Books; as for example, 27 are reckoned in the Epistle to the *Romans*, and the 28th begins at the I. Epistle to the *Corinthians*; and so of the rest to the end of those Epistles: The sum of all the Sections of the Epistles of St. *Paul* is 150.

N. T. Syr.
edit. a
Widm. an.
1562. in
4°.

The first Edition of the *Syriac* New Testament was published by *Widmanstadius* at *Vienna* in *Austria*, in the year 1652. *Ignatius*, a Patriarch of the Sect of the *Jacobites*, sent a certain Priest of *Merdin* named *Moses* into *Europe*, with Orders to cause a *Syriac* New Testament to be printed there, to the end that it might be more common in those Countries where the Christians have not the use of Printing; but none could be found at *Rome* nor at *Venice* that was willing to undertake this Work, which required vast expences and a great deal of care and judgment; at length *Albertus Widmanstadius*, who had formerly projected the same design accomplished it with very good success at *Vienna*, the Emperour *Ferdinand* having furnished him with all things necessary for this undertaking, which might prove so advantageous to the whole Church in general, and in particular to the *Syrian* Nations that are dispersed throughout all *Asia*. There are no other Books of the New Testament in this *Syriac* Edition, which is the Original of all the others, but those that have been above remarked in the MSS. Copies. The Manuscript brought by the Priest of *Merdin* contained onely three Canonical Epistles, and the *Revelation* was also wanting therein. Nothing was ever seen more curious and better proportioned than the Characters of this fair Edition, which imitates the Manuscripts in this respect, that but part of the Vowel-points are expressed, which are usually added to the words, that they might be more easily read. The Oriental Authors very often neglect these Points in their MSS. and they that insert them therein, onely retain those that are most necessary. *Widmanstadius* hath also observed this in his Edition, and hath followed the Manuscripts in several other particulars, especially in a Table or Index of the Lessons recited in the *Syrian* Churches throughout the whole year; moreover, we find in this Edition the Title of every Lesson written in the body of the Book in Characters called *Estrangelo's*; and the number of the Sections

tions is marked in the margent. Seeing this *Syriac* New Testament was printed at the solicitation of some Christians of the *Levant*, and chiefly for their use, it would have been needless to annex thereto a *Latin* Interpretation.

Immanuel Tremellius, a Professor of Divinity at *Heidelberg*, afterwards set forth this *Syriac* New Testament in *Hebrew* Characters, adding all the Vowel-points, and a *Latin* Version that answers to the *Syriac*; *Henry Stephen* printed it in *Folio* at *Geneva*, anno 1569. with the *Greek* Text and *Beza's* Translation over against the *Greek*; infomuch that the *Greek* original and the ancient *Latin* Version may be seen at once in this Edition. The same *Tremellius* in his Epistle to *Elizabeth*, Queen of England, which serves as a Preface to his Book, makes mention of a *Syriac* Manuscript that he found in the Library of *Frederic III.* Elector *Palatin*: He observes that the 7th Verse of Chap. 5. of the I. Epistle of *St. John* was wanting in his Manuscript as well as in the Edition of *Widmanstadius*, which he onely caused to be reprinted as to the *Syriac*, inserting some Notes in the Margent, but they are not very considerable: Neither does he seem to be exact, when he affirms in his Preface, that the Patriarch of *Antioch* (he means the above-mentioned *Ignatius*) did not make use of the *Latin* tongue in the Service that was celebrated in the Churches, but of the *Syriac*, which is understood by the People of that Countrey: *In suis Ecclesiis non Latino, sed qui illic intelligitur, Syriaco sermone uti.* Thus this Protestant suits every thing to his own private opinions; he ought to be informed that they speak the *Arabic* tongue in that place, aswell as the *Maronites* who inhabit Mount *Libanus*; for the *Syrian* common People have for a long time been ignorant of the *Syriac* language, which amongst them supplies the same place as the *Latin* in *Europe*; nay, the most part of their Priests are not perfectly Masters thereof, as I have intimated on several occasions.

The *Syriac* New Testament of *Widmanstadius* hath been reprinted in *Hebrew* and *Syriac* Characters in the fifth Tome of the Royal Bible of *Philip II.* anno 1571. *Guido Fabricius Boderensis* of *Falaize* in *Normandy* annexed to this Edition a *Latin* Interpretation of the *Syriac*, which he composed since the year 1567. as he himself declares, and gave it to *Plantin*, who afterwards obliged him to come to *Antwerpt*, to assist him in the printing of the *Syriac* Edition of the New Testament. He corrected some faults (which were in that of *Widmanstadius* by an ancient Manuscript that *William Postel* had brought from the *Levant*, *Quo emendatissimo codice MS.* (says he) *plurimum sanè adjuti fuimus, ejusque fidem secuti loca plurima partim mutila & detruncata, partim perperam & mendose in Viennensi exemplari scripta, restituimus.* He assures us moreover, (a) that

N. T. Syr.
ed. à Tremell.
ann. 1569. in
fol.

N. T. Syr.
MS. in Bibl.
Palat.

Tremell.
Ep. ad Elizabeth.
Regin. Angl.

N. T. Syr.
ed. in Bibl.
Reg. ann. 1571.

N. T. Syr.
MS. Postel.
Gui. Fabr.
Boder.
Præf. in
Vers. Lat.
N. T. Syr.

(a) *Cùm jam Epistolæ Pauli recognoscerem, per literas nos monuit Andreas Masius... de quibusdam erratis quæ inter excudendum Viennensi exemplar in Paulinas Epistolas irrepserant.*

Boder. ib. whilst he took pains in revising the Epistles of St. Paul, Masius gave him an account in his Letters of some faults that had escaped the Press in the Edition of *Vienna*, and that he followed the judgment of this Learned man, having also re-established several passages by the means of his Manuscript; he subjoins, that he found not therein the four Catholic Epistles, nor the *Revelation*, which were wanting in the Edition of *Vienna*; nevertheless he is persuaded that the *Syrians* have those Books as well as we, and that they receive them as Divine and authentic. *Quamvis apud Syros reperiantur, ac pro sacris & authenticis habeantur.*

Ibid.

The Veneration that he had for the *Syriac* Version by reason of its great antiquity, hath caused him to fall into gross mistakes, as when he produces in his Preface some words which are purely *Syriac* (b) and infers from thence, that it is not probable that the Gospel which was heretofore used by the *Ebionites* was the Original of St. Matthew; this he endeavours to prove by this Argument, that the *Syrians* and other primitive Christians who had seen our Saviour *Jesus Christ* in the flesh, had entirely abandoned the *Hebrew* Text and the ancient Versions of the *Jews*, to take others that were new and very different from the Old, that they might altogether depart from the *Ebionites* and other Hereticks of those first Ages of Christianity. But, not to repeat what I have said elsewhere concerning the *Hebrew* or *Chaldaic* Gospel of the *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites*; it may be affirmed that *Boderensis* seems not to have well apprehended this matter; who makes a false supposition that the Apostles or their Disciples translated the New Testament out of *Greek* into *Syriac* being the Dialect of the *Jews* of *Palestine*. He published a second Edition of this New Testament separately in one Volume in 4° at *Paris*, anno 1584. in which the *Syriac* is printed onely in *Hebrew* Characters with an interlineary Version: He hath also adjoined the *Vulgar*, which is placed over against the *Syriac*, and the *Greek* Text at the bottom of the pages; this Work is dedicated to King *Henry III.*

N. T. Syr.
edit. in 4°.
Guid. Fabr.
Boder. an.
1584.

N. T. Syr.
edit. à
Troft. in
4°. Corthe-
nis Anthal-
tinorum
ann. 1621.

Martinus Trostius caused a new Edition of the *Syriac* New Testament more commodious than the preceding, to be printed in the year 1621. for it contained onely this Version in *Syriac* Characters, together with a *Latin* Interpretation subjoined at the foot of the pages. Since he had not any *Syriac* MS. he onely reprinted the other Editions, the various

rant. *Ea non tantum hujus doctissimi ac piiissimi viri judicio cui multum tribuimus, sed etiam expresso suffragio exemplaris MS. sustulimus atque emendavimus.* Guido Fabr. Bod. Præf. in Veri. Lat. N. T. Syr.

(b) Idcirco non est verisimile Evangelium illud quo utebantur Ebionita germanum fuisse Matthæi autographum, quod jam à temporibus nascentis Ecclesiæ Syros primosque Christianos, qui Dominum nostrum viderant & audierant, constet relictis antiquis scripturæ Hebræicæ, quibus à Captivitate Babylonica etiam in Chaldaismo Judæi semper usi fuerant, novis à veteribus plurimum discrepantibus, ne quid haberent commune cum Ebionitis & aliis hæreticis, usos fuisse. Guido Fabr. Boder. ibid.

readings of which he hath distinctly collected in the end of his Book. But forasmuch as this Volume was too large, and consequently not very convenient for the use of private persons, *Ægidius Gutbirius*, a Professor of Divinity, published it in a lesser form and in smaller letters, at *Ham-bourg*, in the year 1663. This Edition is a very fair one, except the Pa-per, which is not good. The Author, who made this Impression at his own Charges, declares in his Preface, that he hath followed *Trostius's* Edition, onely adding the Books, as also several Vowel-points which were wanting; therefore we find therein all the Canonical Epistles, and the *Revelation*: He hath moreover annexed certain Notes in which he principally remarks the Variations of the other *Syriac* Editions in the Vowel-points: He mentions in the Preface before his Annotations a *Syriac* Manuscript which he had of *Constantine* the Emperor; wherein the History of the Adulterous Woman, the IV. Catholic Epistles, and the *Revelation*, were not inserted. Since the Vowel-points were marked in this MS. he made use thereof to stablish them in the Edition of *Trostius*, which he hath onely reprinted.

Furthermore, the *Syrians* not having any *Masorettes* amongst them to adjust the Points in their Copies in imitation of the *Jews*, it is no wonder that we meet with so many Variations therein; and this is the cause that but part of these Points, viz. the principal, are found in their Manuscripts, and these too are seen onely in some few Copies, for they are not expressed in the best and most ancient. *Gutbirius* attributes this great diversity of Vowels to the alteration of the Languages, which are differently pronounced, according to the various circumstances of time and place, from whence arose the different Dialects of the *Syriac* tongue. *Quis ignorat* (says he) *variā esse linguarum fortunam, varias mutationes & dialectos, præcipue circa voces antiquiores & vocales. Nihil igitur mirum est in tot Novi Testamenti Syriaci manuscriptis, editionibus, certisque earum vocibus, modo Hierosolymitanam, modo Maroniticam sive Comagenam, modo Antiochenam, aut aliam dialectum citra mutationem sensus usurpatam ad nostram ætatem pervenisse.*

But besides the Difference of the *Syriac* Dialects, it must be acknowledged that this Diversity often proceeds from the Judgment of those who have added these Points in the Manuscript Copies and of those that have supplied them in the places where they were wanting. I admire that *Gutbirius* hath taken no notice of the *Syriac* Edition of the New Testament, which is in the two Polyglott Bibles; this would have been more usefull for his design than any other; for, besides that the Vowel-points are wanting in few places, *Gabriel Sionita*, who published it, was very skillfull in the *Syriac* tongue.

To all these Editions of the *Syriac* New Testament we may add another in 24°. printed by *Plantin*, anno 1575. in *Hebrew* Characters, without any Point-vowels, which contains onely what is inserted in the Edition of the Royal Bible of *Philip II.* together with some different Readings

N. T. Syr.
Ægi. Gut-
bir. in 8°. ann. 1663.

N. T. Syr.
MS.

Gutbir.
Præf. in
not. N. T.
Syr.

dings at the end collected by *Raphalengius*. This little *Syriac* New Testament hath been reprinted within these few years in *Germany* in the same Volume.

CHAP. XV.

A particular Discussion of the Syriac Version of the New Testament.

HAVING already discoursed of the *Syriac* Version of the New Testament in general, it will be convenient here to examine it in particular; for this being one of the most ancient Translations of the Church, the *Greek* Original (from which it was composed with sufficient exactness) may be re-established by the help thereof in several places; nevertheless there are some passages where it seems rather to be a Paraphrase or Explication than a literal Interpretation; but besides that this doth not frequently happen, we may discern without much difficulty even in those particular instances the reading of the *Greek* Copy from whence it was taken; and this is the principal use that we ought to make of these ancient Versions of the H. Scriptures, which serve to represent to us the first Originals. It is necessary to distinguish, as in the *Greek* and *Latin*, the Titles of the Books from the Text; for those Titles, as well as many other things that are at the beginning and at the end of the *Syriac* Manuscripts, do not appertain to the Sacred Authours, having been added afterwards, the Copiers have also inserted therein some words after their usual method, which causeth a difference in the MSS. Copies; but they all agree in certain expressions that have been taken from the *Greek*, and which are in some manner consecrated to the use of the Churches.

The *Syrians* for example, do all preserve the *Greek* word *Εὐαγγέλιον*, *Gospel*, and explain it at the same time by the word *ܩܠܝܬܐ* which signifies *Preaching*, so that the *Gospel* of St. *Matthew* is nothing else (as they believe) but his *Preaching* or *Sermons*; they have likewise made use of the word *ܐܦܫܬܐܝܬܐ* to denote *The Acts of the Apostles*, and in translating from the *Greek*, they have retained in their Version a great number of *Greek* words which they have *syriacized*, especially in some places that they could not so well express literally. They adopted these *Greek* words in their Translation with so much the more ease, in regard that the *Syriac* tongue had already admitted divers under the Empire of the *Macedonians*: They have also substituted certain *Greek* expressions in the room of others which seemed to them to be too general. Thus in the second Chapter of *The Acts of the Apostles*, versè 42. whereas it is read simply in the

Greek

word ܐܢܕܐ; which signifies *height* as well as the name of a place; this first sense agrees with the explication of St. *Jerom* in his Commentary on this Gospel. The Greek word *δῆμιον* in the same verse is not read in the Syriac nor in our Vulgar. In the 23d verse, where it is in all the Greek Copies *διὰ τῶν Προφητῶν*, by the Prophets, *Beza* hath observed that the Syrian Interpreter renders it, by the Prophet; but this last reading may be imputed rather to the person that hath inserted the Vowel-points, than to the Interpreter: Indeed it is written in the Arabic Version, by the Prophets.

In the 3d Chapter, verse 2. the Syrian Interpreter very well expresses the Greek Verb *μετανοεῖτε*, *repent*, by the Verb ܐܬܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ which is the same thing as *pœnitentiam agite* in our Vulgar; for although it signifies *return* in the Grammatical sense, nevertheless it is used by the Christians of the Levant, and even by the Jews, to denote that which we call *repentance*; these last do frequently in their Books apply the word ܬܫܝܒܐ to the same sense; and their repentance is likewise accompanied with the confession of sins. In the 6th verse, where it is in the Greek *ἑξομολογούμενοι*, *confessing*, and in the Vulgar *confitentes*; the Syriac hath according to the same sense ܬܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ and the Jews express the confession of their sins by a like word.

In the 4th Chapter, verse 1. the Syrian Translator adds the word ܬܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ *holiness*, after that of *πνεῦμα*, *spirit*, as if it had been written in his Greek Copy *ἁγίῳ*, *holy*, or rather it is a Gloss that was annexed to limit the sense. In the 18th verse, instead of the Greek word *Πέτρος*, *Peter*, we find in the Syriac ܬܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ which signifies *a stone*.

In the 5th Chapter, ver. 3. where we read in the Greek *πτωχοὶ*, *poor*, the word in the Syriac is ܬܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ which signifies *People truly poor*, and the word *πνεῦμα* is translated as if it were written *ἐν πνεύματι*, *in spirit*. In the 18th verse, the Greek word *κεφαλα*, *title*, to which *apex* answers in our Version, is translated in the Syriac by ܬܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ which signifies *a little line*, or *stroak*. In the 22th verse the Greek word *εἰκὴ*, *without a cause*, is retained in the Syriac, which is onely written in Syriac Characters, and therefore this Interpreter read it in his Greek Copy: it is found even at this day in all the Greek Copies, except that of the Vatican; nevertheless St. *Jerom* must of necessity have had some in which it was not inserted; for he plainly declares that it is not in the true Copies, meaning thereby the Greek Original. The word *raka* which is Syriac is retained in the same place, as also that of *gehenna*, which is derived from the Hebrew. In the 25th verse, instead of *ἐκείνῳ*, *to the officer*, which signifies all manner of ministers or servants in general, it is in the Syriac ܬܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ which answers to the Greek word *συναγγραφεύς*, *a collector of tribute*, in St. *Luke*, chap. 12. v. 58. and it is in the Vulgar *exactori*. In the 26th verse, the Latin word *grecized* *nod egvltw*, *farthing*, is translated by that of ܬܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ which signifies, according to the Interpretation of *Fer-*

rarius in his Dictionary, a certain piece of money. Gabriel Sionita hath render'd it in his Version *obolum*. The Syrian Interpreter hath also preserved the Latin word grecized, *μίλιον*, a mile, which he hath syriacized. In the 44th verse, we read in the Syriac aswell as in the ordinary Greek these words, *εὐλογεῖτε τὰς καταραμύνας ὑμᾶς*, *bleſs them that curse you*, which are not found in some Greek Copies, nor in St. Jerom's Edition. Zegerius believed that they belonged to St. Luke, from whence they were added to the Text of St. Matthew, and they are retained in our Vulgar. In the 45th verse, where it is in the Greek *ὅτι*, for, we read in the Syriac *ܐܝܢܐ* it is he who; so that this Interpreter read *ܕܝܢ*, and we have also in our Latin Edition, *qui*, conformably to this reading. In the 47th verse, the Greek word *ἀσπάσηδε*, *ye salute*, is expressed in the Syriac by two words which literally signifie, *ye shall demand peace*, that is to say, *ye shall salute*, as it is in our Vulgar.

In the 6th Chapter, verse 1. where it is read in the ordinary Greek, *ἐλεημοσύνην*, *alms*, we find a word in the Syriac which according to the Grammatical sense signifies *justice*, wherefore this Interpreter read *δικαιοσύνην*, in the Greek, conformably to our Vulgar, and to some Greek Copies. In the 2d verse of the same Chapter, instead of *ἀπέχεσθαι*, *have*, which is in the Greek, it is in the Syriac *ܐܕܪܝܬܐ* *have received*, as in the Vulgar. In the 6th verse, the Syrian Translator hath expressed these words, *ἐν τῷ κρύπτῳ & ἐν τῷ φανερῳ*, *in secret and openly*, as they are in the ordinary Greek; nevertheless this last expression is not in our Vulgar, nor in some Greek Copies. In the 7th verse, instead of the Greek Verb *βαπτολογήσατε*, *to use vain repetitions*, there is a Verb in the Syriac that signifies *to wrangle*, or *to talk too much*. The Greek word *ἐμπόσιον*, *daily*, in the 11th verse is translated by a word signifying, *of which we stand in need*; that very well expresses the sense, for mention is made in that place of our ordinary food, which we always want. In the 12th verse, the Greek word *ὀφειλήματα* is well translated, according to the letter, by *ܕܒܝܠܐ* *debts*; and this same word also signifies *sins* in the language of the Syrians and Jews. This addition, *for thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, for ever*, is in the Syriac aswell as in the ordinary Greek. In the 17th verse there is a transposition of those words, *wash thy face, and anoint thine head*. In the 18th verse these words, *ἐν τῷ φανερῳ*, *openly*, which are in the ordinary Greek, are omitted in the Syriac as in the Vulgar. In the 24th verse, the Syrian Interpreter hath render'd the Greek word *ἀνδέξασθαι*, *will hold to*, thus, *will honour*; and hath retained the word *mammona* which is Syriac, and signifies *riches*, as it is in the Arabic; and in verse 25 he hath read these words, *καὶ τὸ πίνει*, *and what ye shall drink*, in his Greek Copy, which are not expressed in the Vulgar.

In the 7th Chapter, verse 1. we do not find in the Syriac those words that were in our Latin Edition before the correction of Clement VIII. *Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned*; nevertheless Robert Stephen read

read them in one of his *Greek* Manuscripts which apparently belonged to the number of those ancient Copies in which several Gospels were confounded together, for these same words are in *St. Luke*, Chap. 6. v. 37. In the 24th verse of the same Chapter, where it is in the ordinary *Greek* ὁμοιωσω, *I will liken*, the *Syriac* hath read with our *Latin* Interpreter, ὁμοιωθήσεται, *shall be likened*, as it is also in an ancient *Greek* Manuscript cited by *Beza*. In the 29th verse, we read in the *Syriac* as well as in our *Vulgar*, eorum & Pharisei, which confirms the *Greek* reading of the *Marquês de Velec*, which nevertheless is not found in any other *Greek* Manuscript.

In the 8th Chapter, verse 5. instead of ἐκ τὸν ὑπαρχον, we find in the *Syriac*, as in our *Vulgar*, the *Latin* word *Centurio*. In the 14th verse of the same Chapter, the word *Simon's* is put in the room of Πέτρος, *Peter's*, which is in the *Greek*. In the 24th verse, the *Syrian* Translator hath added *Jesus* after the particle δέ. In the 28th verse, instead of Γεργεσένων, *of the Gergesenes*, we read in the *Syriac*, *of the Gadarenes*: the *Greek* word χαλεποί, *fierce*, in the same place, is translated in the *Syriac* by this ܠܥܕ that is to say, *wicked*, or *cruel*, which answers to *ſævi* in the *Vulgar*, for this *Syriac* word signifies both. In the 30th verse it is written in the *Syriac*, as in the *Greek*, a good way off from them; whereas it is in the *Vulgar*, not far from them; the *Syriac* words might also be render'd beyond them, which seems to make a more convenient sense. The *Syrian* Interpreter doth not literally express the 32d verse, having added some words, so that it may be esteemed as a *Paraphrase*, rather than a verbal Translation.

In the 9th Chapter, verse 4. it is not read in the *Syriac* ἰδων, *seeing*, as it is in the *Greek*, but εἰδώς, *knowing*. In the 8th verse of the same Chapter, where we read in the ordinary *Greek* ἐθαύμασαν, *they marvelled*, it is written in the *Syriac*, as in some ancient *Greek* Manuscript, ἐφοβήθησαν, *they were afraid*; and we likewise read in the *Vulgar*, *timuerunt*, according to this reading. In the 13th verse we do not find in the *Syriac*, nor in the *Vulgar*, nor even in some ancient *Greek* Copies, εἰς μετάνοιαν, *to repentance*. In the 18th verse, we read in the *Syriac*, one, and unus in the *Vulgar* after ἄρχων, and this word εἷς is also expressed in some *Greek* Copies. In the 30th verse, the word *immediately* is read in the *Syriac* before ἀνεώχθησαν, *were opened*; this reading is confirmed by one of *Robert Stephen's* Manuscripts in which there is ἰσταμένη. In the 35th verse, we do not read in the *Syriac*, in the *Vulgar*, nor in some *Greek* Manuscripts, ἐν τῷ λαῷ, *among the people*. In the 36th verse, where it is in the ordinary *Greek* ἦσαν ἐκλελυμένοι, *they fainted*, we find in the *Syriac* Translation, as in the *Latin* and in several *Greek* Copies, ἦσαν ἐσκλημένοι, *they were tired*.

In the 10th Chapter, verse 1. where it is in the ordinary *Greek*, πνευμάτων, *of spirits*, we find in the *Syriac*, as in some *Greek* Copies, κατὰ πνευμάτων, *against spirits*. In the 2d verse of the same Chapter, instead of

of *Nine*, Peter, which is in the *Greek*, we read in the *Syriac*, as above, *ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲩ* a stone. In the 4th verse, where we read in the ordinary *Greek*, *Ἰσκαριώτης*, *Iscariot*, the *Syriac* hath simply, *ⲟⲩⲁⲗⲁⲓⲁⲩⲁⲩⲁⲩ*, *Scariot*, which reading is confirmed by the *Cambridge Copy*. In the 8th verse, these words are read in the *Syriac*, *raise the dead*, as in the ordinary *Greek Copies*; and they are likewise expressed in our *Vulgar*, but in a different order from the *Greek*; the *Louvain Divines*, who believed that they did not belong to the Text of *St. Matthew*, have marked them with an obelisk in their Edition; and indeed they are not inserted in some *Latin Copies*. In the 12th verse, these words are not read in the *Syriac*, which are in several *Greek Copies*, and in our *Latin Edition*, saying, *Peace be to this house*. The *Syrian Interpreter* seems to have read *ἀπλῆσαι* in the 16th verse, conformably to the *Cambridge Manuscript*, instead of *ἀνέγειν*, having translated it *ⲙⲉⲙⲉⲗ* that is to say, *simple*; as the *Vulgar* hath *simplices*. In the 23d verse, where it is in the *Greek* simply, *τὰς πόλεις*, the *Cities*, it is render'd in the *Syriac* as if it were read *πάσας τὰς πόλεις*, all the *Cities*. In the 25th verse, we read in the *Syriac* as in the *Vulgar*, *Beelzebub*; whereas it is written in the ordinary *Greek Copies* *Beelzeboul*. In the 38th verse, the *Syrian Translator* hath expressed the *Greek Verb* *λαμβάνει*, *taketh*, by *ⲛⲁⲥⲁ* *carrieth*; and indeed the same Verb *naſca*, among the *Hebrews* signifies, *to take*, and *to carry*.

In the 11th Chapter, verse 2. we do not read *ⲁⲩⲟ*, *two*, in the *Syriac*, as it is in the ordinary *Greek Copies*, but *ⲁⲩⲁ*, *by*, as it is written in the ancient Manuscript of *Cambridge*. In the 8th verse of the same Chapter, instead of the *Greek word* *ἀλλὰ*, *but*, we find *ⲁⲩⲁ* *two* in the *Syriac* *ⲙⲉⲙⲉⲗ* *if not*; but perhaps it ought to be read by a single word, thus, *ⲙⲉⲙⲉⲗ* which signifies *but*. In the 19th verse, where it is expressed in the *Greek* and in the *Vulgar*, *of her children*, it is translated in the *Syriac*, *by her works*; as if this Interpreter had read *ἔργων* instead of *τέκνων*, or rather, he had respect onely to the sense.

In the 12th Chapter, verse 4. where we read in the *Greek*, *τὸ ἀγνόν & αἰσθητόν*, the *shew-bread*; it is render'd in the *Syriac* rather according to the sense than the words, *the bread of the Lord's table*; the *Syrian Interpreter* hath very well translated the *Greek word* *εἰμή*, which according to the Grammatical sense signifies, *unless*, in expressing it by the single word *ⲙⲉⲙⲉⲗ* *but*. In the 5th verse, these words, *τὴν αἰσθητὴν*, *on the sabbath days*, are not inserted in the *Syriac*. In the 10th verse, after *ἦν*, *there was*, we find in the *Syriac* this word, *ἐκεῖ*, *in that place*, as it is in some ancient *Greek Copies*. In the 12th verse, instead of the Particle *ἔτι*, *then*, which is in the *Greek*, the *Syriac* hath *ⲙⲉⲙⲉⲗ* *now*, which makes a better sense. In the 21st verse, where it is in the *Greek*, *πνεῦμα*, the *Syrian Interpreter* hath translated against the *holy Ghost*, as if he had read *ⲡⲛⲉῦⲙⲁ*, or rather he hath followed the sense.

In the 13th Chapter, verse 10. the word *αὐτοῖς*, is added after *μαθηταῖς*, *his disciples*. Since these kinds of additions are frequent in the Version, it would be needless to insist thereon, because they usually proceed from the Translators. Thus the Syrian Interpreter after *οὐκ ἐστὶν* hath added *οὐδ' αὐτοῖς*, this Pronoun being necessary to render the sense more clear.

In the 32d verse, the word *πάντων*, of all, is read after *μεῖζον*, the greatest, in the Syrian, which is not in the ordinary Greek: It is also expressed in the Vulgar according to this reading, *omnibus*. In the 36th verse, the Syrian Interpreter hath translated, *of the tares and of the field*, as if he had read in his Greek Copy, *καὶ τὰ ἄγρε*. In the 46th verse, whereas it is in the ordinary Greek, *ὅς εὗρεν*, who when he had found, it is read in the Syrian, as in the Vulgar, *εὗρεν δ'*, but when he had found. In the 51st verse, we read these words in the Syrian as well as in the ordinary Greek, which are not found in the Vulgar, nor in the Cambridge Manuscript; *Ἰησοῦς λαλοῦσιν αὐτοῖς*. In the 52d verse, where it is read in the Greek, *μαθητεύσας*, instructed, the Syrian hath *μαθήσας*; that is to say, as Gabriel Sionita hath render'd it, *who shews himself a disciple*, which makes a good sense.

In the 14th Chapter, verse 1. the Syrian Translator hath retained the Greek word *φίλιππος*, and syriacized it. In the 3d verse, we read in the Syrian, as in the ordinary Greek, *φίλιππος*, Philip, but this word is not expressed in our Latin Edition, nor in the Cambridge Manuscript. In the 19th verse, the Syrian Interpreter had not in his Greek Copy *τὰς ἄρτας*, the loaves: And in the 24th verse, where it is in the Greek, *ἢν μίτον ἢ δαλάρους*, now in the midst of the sea; he hath translated the sense rather than the words after this manner, *was many furlongs distant from the land*. In the 34th verse, instead of *Γεννησαρέτ*, Genesaret, it is read in the Syrian as in the Vulgar, *Genesar*; which reading is confirmed by the Copy of the Marquess de Velec.

In the 15th Chapter, verse 2. the Greek word *παράδοσιν* is very well expressed in the Syrian by the word *ἔδωκεν* which signifies *tradition*, even according to the Grammatical sense. In the 5th verse the words *ἐξ ἐμῆ* are transposed, and read after the Verb *ὡφελόντες* in this verse, *my offering is that which will be profitable to you on my behalf*. In the 8th verse, these words are not read in the Syrian, which are in the ordinary Greek; *ἐγγιζέμενοι . . . ὁ λαὸς ἔτι τοῖς σιμαῖ αὐτοῦ*, this people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth; neither are they inserted in our Vulgar, conformably to the ancient Manuscript of Cambridge, where it is simply, *ὁ λαὸς ἔτι τοῖς χαίλεσι με τιμᾷ*, this people honoureth me with their lips. In the 15th verse, instead of *ὁ Πέτρος*, Peter, it is in the Syrian, *Σίμων Σεβας*. In the 19th verse, the word *μορχείαι*, adulteries, precedes that of *φόνος*, murders. In the 24th verse, where we read in the Greek, *τὰ ἀπολωλῆτα*, lost, it is expressed in the Syrian according to the sense by a word that signifies *strayed*. In the 27th verse, these words, *and live*, are added in the Syrian after *αὐτοῖς*, which seem to be a Gloss, because they are not in any other

other Copy. In the 31st verse, these words, *κύλλες ὄρεται*, the maimed to be whole, are in the Syriac, as well as in the ordinary Greek, but they are not found in our Latin Edition, neither hath the Marquess de Velle read them in any of his Manuscripts. In the 36th verse, where it is read in the Greek, *εὐχαριστίας*, gave thanks, we find the Verb *ᾠ* in the Syriac, which signifies, *he praised*, that is to say, he repeated the Prayer that the Jews call *praise* or *benediction*, which perfectly expresses the sense of this passage. We read also in the same place in the Syriac the Verb *gave* after *μαθηταί*, disciples, as in the Vulgar; but it is not in the Greek. In the 37th verse, the Greek word *σποδίας*, baskets, is retained and Syriacized. In the 39th verse, whereas we read in the ordinary Greek *Μαγδαλά*, Magdala, the Syriac hath *Magedo*, which comes near *Magedan* in the Vulgar.

In the 16th Chapter, verse 3. instead of *ῥιναῖς*, can, which is in the ordinary Greek, it is written in the Syriac *οὐρίσσε*, know, as it is also read in some Greek Copies; moreover this Interpreter hath added, *discern*, having translated this passage thus, *know ye not how to discern*. The word *scire* is likewise found in the Vulgar, though it is not in the ordinary Greek. In the 11th verse, the word *ἀλλὰ*, but, is added in the Syriac after *ὑμῶν*, which makes a good sense. In the 13th verse, where it is in the ordinary Greek, *ἐγώ*, that I, it is read in the Syriac, *ᾠ* of me, this Pronoun is not expressed in the Vulgar, nor in some Greek Copies. In the 23d verse, instead of *μοι* the Syrian Interpreter hath read *ἐμοί*, unto me, conformably to the Cambridge Manuscript, and the Vulgar hath *mibi*, according to this reading. In the 27th verse, where we read in the ordinary Greek, *Ἀγγέλων*, Angels, it is written in the Syriac, *holy Angels*; as it is also written in some ancient Greek Copies.

It were needless to instance in a greater number of passages in St. Matthew's Gospel, and even to insist any longer on the Syriac Version of the New Testament, seeing that those we have already produced are sufficient to shew its exactness, and we are thereby informed at the same time, that it confirms our Latin Edition in many places; therefore the ordinary Greek ought not always to serve as a rule in our Critical Enquiries: Since this Translation is very ancient, it is not to be admired that it sometimes agrees with the Cambridge Manuscript, and consequently with the *Italic*; but it may be affirmed in general, that it more frequently agrees with the Greek Copies by which St. Jerom revised the ancient Vulgar translation, than with those to which this last was conformable. We read for example in the Syriac, the 14th verse of the 23d Chapter of St. Matthew, which is not in the ancient MS. of Cambridge. It is rare to see any additions in the Syriac Version of the New Testament that are not supported by some Greek Copy, and when this happens, they ought rather to be attributed to the Transcribers than to the diversity of the Copies. Thus we read in the 28th Chapter of St. Matthew, verse 18. after *γῆς*, earth, these words, *and as my Father hath sent*

we, even so send I you, which are in no Greek Copy in this place, but onely in the Persian translation that was made from the Syriac; they were taken out of the 20th Chapter of St. John, verse 21.

Furthermore, this Version is not altogether so pure in the Epistles of St. Paul as in the Gospels; for in regard that the style of those Epistles is obscure and intricate, the Syrian Interpreter hath taken more Liberty therein, departing sometimes from his Original; this he begins to doe in the very first words of the Epistle to the Romans; for whereas it is read in the Greek simply *καλητός ἀπόστολος*, he hath translated, as if it were *καλητός καὶ ἀπόστολος*, called and an Apostle; nevertheless, St. Paul hath not separated these two words; and the sense is, that he was called to be an Apostle. In the 4th verse of this Chapter, where we read in the Greek, *ὃς δεδοσμένος*, declared, or determined, in the Vulgar, *qui prædestinatus est*, who was predestinated, it is expressed in the Syriac by word that signifies, and was known, which doth not exactly answer the Greek word that properly imports determined, and this ought also to be understood in this place in our Vulgar, by the word *prædestinatus*. However, with respect to the sense, this same Verb which signifies among the Syrians, *was known*, doth likewise signifie, *was ordained or appointed*.

In the 6th verse of this same Chapter, where we read in the Greek, *καλεῖται Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, the called of Jesus Christ, it is translated in the Syriac, *called in Jesus Christ*, or rather, *by Jesus Christ*, as it is also in the Vulgar; for the Preposition *ἐν* signifies, as in the Hebrew tongue, *in and by*. In the 9th verse, the Syrian Interpreter hath left out the Pronoun *μεν*, having translated this passage simply *ἐν πνεύματι*, or *per spiritum*, as if he had only read in his Copy *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*, which renders the sense ambiguous, because it might be indifferently applied to his own, and to the Spirit of God. Moreover, this Interpreter hath distinguished the 9th and 10th verses after another manner than they are in the ordinary Greek, for he comprizeth all these words under one connexion, *μενέτω ὑμῶν ποιεῖν πάντες ὅτι ἡμεῖς προσευχόμεθα ὑμῖν*. I make mention of you always in my prayers: and reads afterwards in the following verse, *καὶ δεόμεθα ὑμῖν*, and making supplication; nevertheless this doth not alter the sense. But since it is not expedient to run through all the Epistles of St. Paul, it may suffice to intimate in general, that the Syrian Interpreter hath taken a much greater liberty in those Epistles than in the Gospels. I shall onely add here, that the Syrians, in all their Copies, acknowledge the Epistle to the Hebrews to be certainly written by this Holy Apostle; for they mention fourteen in the general Title under the name of St. Paul.

C H A P. XVI.

Of the Coptics ; Of their Language ; and of their Version of the Holy Scriptures in the Coptic tongue ; and chiefly of that of the New Testament.

IT cannot be denied, but that the People of Egypt have had the Bible translated into the Language of their Countrey, since mention is made thereof in the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers. The Successors of Alexander, who kept their Court at Alexandria, brought thither the Greek tongue : however, this doth not hinder but that the Egyptian might remain in several places ; especially in Thebais, where nevertheless it was not so pure as at first ; insomuch that that part of this Language which is left to us at this day, is intermix'd with an infinite number of Greek words, from whence its Characters have been also borrowed. The word Coptic is the same as that of Egypt, the pronounciation being onely altered, as it usually happens to proper Names in process of time.

Mr. Vossius, who delights in maintaining Paradoxes, believes that there was no Coptic before Egypt was subdued by the Arabians, because this Language (according to his opinion) is a mixture of the Greek and the Arabian ; since the very name of Coptic was not known in the World before the Arabians became Masters of Egypt : *Ne nomen quidem (saith he) Coptica linguæ extitit antequam Arabes potirentur Egypto. Ipsa quin etiam id satis testatur lingua, quæ tota ex Græco & Arabico translata est sermone.*

If. Voss.
Resp. ad
iter. P.
Sim. ob.

But he himself acknowledges that these two words *Egyptus* and *Egyptus* are the same : I grant that these People pronounced the word Coptic instead of that of Egyptian, since the Arabic was spoken among them, but can it be inferred from thence, that there was no Egyptian tongue before that time ? This onely proves that that which hath been formerly called Egyptian, was afterwards, by a corruption of the Language, named Coptic : And although we should admit that the Arabians have introduced some words of their Language into the ancient Coptic or Egyptian ; can Mr. Vossius conclude from thence, that there was no Coptic or Egyptian tongue before that time ? he might avouch with as much reason, that the Persians and Turks do no longer speak their ancient tongue, because they are mingled with an infinite number of Arabic words, and indeed have no other Characters but those of the Arabians : the example that he produceth of the Language which was used among the Gauls before Cæsar's time, and which is not the same as the present French, is foreign from the purpose ; for it is certain that our French is not derived from this ancient Gaulish tongue : moreover, it is not true, that the Coptic is nothing else but a mixture of the Greek and Arabic. Mr. Vossius ought likewise to have added, and of the Latin ; for there are some Latin words in this Language,

If. Voss.
Resp. ad
tert. P.
Sim. obj.

Language, the proper foundation of which is the ancient *Egyptian*, distinguished from the *Greek* and *Arabic*: The *Greek* was admitted into it a long while before the appearing of the Christian Religion, and the *Arabic* words that are found therein may also be very ancient, and before the Dominion of the *Arabians* over that Countrey. The Geographers affirm, that the Capital City of *Thebais* called *Coptos* was the place to which the *Arabians*, *Indians* and *Ethiopians* brought their Merchandizes: and therefore it is no wonder that the commerce of the *Egyptians* with the *Arabians* and *Ethiopians* hath introduced some *Arabic* words into the *Coptic* or *Egyptian* tongue, the *Ethiopian* being almost nothing else but a dialect of the *Arabic*.

Cod. MS.
Bibl. Reg.
n. 329.

We find in the King's Library a Copy of the IV. Gospels written in fair *Coptic* Characters by a Bishop of *Damietta*, about 500 years ago, it imitates the *Greek*, from which it was taken, having the same Sections marked in the margents. This properly is common to all the *Coptic* Copies that have exactly followed the *Greek* from which they were translated, and this is one proof of their antiquity, that they agree with our *Latin* Edition in several places where it is not conformable to the ordinary *Greek* Text. The above mentioned *Coptic* Manuscript contains in the Gospel of St. *John*, the history of the adulterous woman, which answers as in the *Greek*, to the little Section $\pi\varsigma$. 86. Mr. *Marshall* assures us, that

Tho. Marsh.
resch. Obs.
serv. in
Vers. Got.
p. 467.

Cod. MS.
Bibl. Reg.
n. 330.

he also read it in a like *Coptic* Manuscript; but it is not in another MS. of this same Library which is divided into two Columns, one whereof is written in *Coptia*, and the other in *Arabic*. In the first Manuscript, which is purely *Coptic*, certain Pictures of a sufficient largeness are painted in divers places; there is one, amongst others, wherein our Saviour is represented giving his Body to his Disciples, when he instituted their Sacrament; they bow in receiving the Bread which their Master delivered to them to eat, and are in a posture that shews their adoration, conformably to the custome used at that time in the Church of the *Coptics*; moreover, these words are added, written in *Arabic*, to express what is exhibited in this Figure; *The Lord Christ gives bread to his Disciples which he hath consecrated and made his Body and Bloud*. There is also in the King's Library another Manuscript in the *Coptic* tongue, that contains the Epistles of St. *Paul*, the Catholic Epistles, and *The Acts of the Apostles*; and that which chiefly deserves to be observed therein is, that all the Catholic Epistles are inserted as in our *Greek* Copies, and in the same order, viz. one of St. *James*, two of St. *Peter*, three of St. *John*, and one of St. *Jude*. Farthermore, the Testimony of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, is not read in the I. Epistle of St. *John*, as it is not in the most part of the *Greek* Copies. There is found in this same Library another Copy of the Epistles of St. *Paul* written in *Coptic* and

Cod. MS.
Bibl. Reg.
n. 331.

Arabic. These *Coptic* Manuscripts, as hath been already remarked, have preserved the distinctions of the *Greek* Copies, from which the *Coptic* Version of

Cod. MS.
Bibl. Reg.
n. 332.

of

of the New Testament was composed. We read, for example, at the end of the Manuscript that contains *The Acts of the Apostles*, *μετὰ τὸν ἀποστόλου ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Κυρίου, Ἀμην. κεφαλῶν α'. συχὸν τὰς*. Thus the Coptics reckon in *The Acts* 77 Sections or Chapters, and 307 verses: they observe this method in all the other Books, in which they distinguish two kinds of Sections, as in the Greek Manuscripts, viz. the greater, which they call *κεφαλῶν*, and the lesser that are marked in the margents. We shall proceed to illustrate this by some examples. They reckon in the Epistle to the Romans *κεφαλῶν κα. 21. great Sections*, and *πζ. 87. lesser*: they call these small Sections *συγῆ*, and sum up at the end of the Epistle to the Galatians *συχ. πβ. κεφαλῶν ε. Συγῆ κα. 312. verses*, 6. great Sections, and 31. lesser. At the end of the Epistle to the Ephesians *συχ. πβ. κεφαλῶν ε. Συγῆ α. 312. verses*, 6. great Sections, and 30. lesser. At the end of the Epistle to the Philippians *συχ. εη. κεφ. δ. Συγῆ κα. 118. verses*, 4 great Sections, and 21. lesser, and so of the others.

They observe not the same order as we do in the Epistles of St. Paul; for the Epistle to the Hebrews is placed in their Copies immediately after the Second to the Thessalonians; after the Epistle to the Hebrews follow the two to Timothy, that to Titus, and the Epistle to Philemon, which is the last of all. They reckon in the Epistle to the Hebrews *συχὸν τὰς κεφαλῶν ια. Συγῆ εβ. 755. verses*, 11. great Sections, and 62. *συγῆ*. If there be no fault in the numbers, the measure of their verses doth not seem to be certain and determined. They believe that St. Paul is the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews as well as of the others, attributing fourteen to him, as it appears by these words which are in one of their Copies, at the end of these Epistles, *Παυλὶ τῷ ἀγίῳ ἀποστόλῳ ὁπίσθεν ιδ. ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Κυρίου, Ἀμην. οὗς συχὸν εβ. κεφαλῶν εβ. Κεφαλῶν οὐκ*. Since they took these kinds of computations from the Grecians, they wrote them also for the most part in Greek, which have been altered by the Copiers who did not understand them, they observe this likewise with respect to the Titles of every Book. We read, for example, at the beginning of the Epistle of Saint James, *καθολικὸν ὁπίσθεν Ἰακώβου*; and at the end, *κεφαλῶν η'. συχὸν μα.* counting in this Epistle 8. great Sections, and 41. verses. The same thing is practised by them in the other Canonical Epistles, which they annex to those of St. Paul. *The Acts of the Apostles* (according to their division) compose the last part of the New Testament.

Father Kircher hath mentioned some Coptic Manuscripts of the Bible which he had seen at Rome in the Library of the Vatican, and among others a Copy of the four Gospels, in which there are Figures, as in that of the King's Library; he gives an account also of a Manuscript that contains the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, three Canonical Epistles only, and *The Acts of the Apostles*, and lastly, of a Copy in which the Revelation was written in Coptic and Arabic, with this Title, *Ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωάννου εὐαγγελιστοῦ*. It is to be admir'd that this Jesuit, who discoursed in the same place concerning a Coptic Pentateuch, should seek for reasons among

Athen.
Kirch.
Prodr.
Cop. c. 8.

among the *Samaritans* of the number of the Sections and Verses that are found in the Books of the *Coptics*, who in this particular have imitated the *Grecians*, whose Books they translated into their Language. There are also in the King's Library some parts of the Old Testament in the *Coptic* tongue, viz. a Psalter in *Coptic* and *Arabic*, another Psalter purely *Coptic*, and a Volume which contains the Prophets, *Hosea*, *Amos*, *Micah*, *Joel*, *Obadiah*, *Jonah*, *Nabum*, *Zephaniah*, *Haggai*, *Zecharia*, *Malachi* and *Daniel*, which are all written in *Coptic* and *Arabic*. Moreover, we find in the same Library a Lectionary absolutely *Coptic*, taken out of the Gospels, *The Acts of the Apostles*, the Epistles of St. Paul, and the Psalms, which is divided according to the principal Feasts of the *Coptic* Churches. That which shews that those Nations do still continue to recite their Office in the ancient tongue, which is not now understood by them is, that this Lectionary is purely *Coptic*, except the Rubrics, that are written in *Coptic* and *Arabic*. Besides this, there is a Lectionary taken out of *The Acts* and Gospels with this Title, *Αποστολοι και Ευαγγελια*, which is likewise entirely *Coptic*, the Rubrics only being in *Coptic* and *Arabic*.

However, it is not to be doubted but that these People have translated their Books of Offices or Rituals into *Arabic*, which is their mother-tongue, but they annex these Versions only to some Copies, because it is sufficient for the use of their Churches that they are in *Coptic*, with the Rubrics in *Arabic*: They read the *Arabic* Translations in private, whether they are joyned to their *Coptic* Books, or whether they are transcribed separately. Thus we find in the King's Library a Lectionary for the whole time of Lent written in *Coptic* and *Arabic*, which is composed of the Gospels and of the Epistles of St. Paul. They have in like manner translated into *Arabic* certain Hymns in honour of the Virgin *Mary* and of the Saints, a Copy of which is to be seen in the King's Library.

C H A P. XVII.

Of the Ethiopic Version of the New Testament. Of the Armenian Version. A Relation of what lately happened at Marseille concerning the Printing of the Armenian Books: The History of Mesrop, who was the first that invented the Armenian Characters. Of the Persian translation of the New Testament.

THE New Testament was printed in the *Ethiopic* tongue at Rome in the year 1548. but this Edition is very imperfect; the Publishers thereof had at that time in *Ethiopic*, only the four Gospels, the Revelation, the seven Canonical Epistles, *The Acts of the Apostles*, and the Epistle

Epistle to the *Hebrews*; therefore these Books alone were printed at first with this Title, *Testamentum Novum cum Epistola Pauli ad Hebræos*, and the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was placed before *The Acts of the Apostles*: afterwards the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul were published separately, which being annexed to the other Books, compose the whole New Testament. All this is expressed in these words, in an Epistle inserted at the end of the Gospels, *Adverte, Lector, quod Epistola ad Hebræos suo loco non est, posita est autem à nobis ante Acta Apostolorum. Hoc autem ideo factum est, quia cum quatuor Evangelia, Apocalypsim, septem Canonicas Epistolas & Acta typis jam hinc biennio excudi fecerimus, Pauli Epistolas Italiae non habebamus, nisi illam quæ est ad Hebræos.* The principal Author of this Edition mentioned in the same place, is *Tesfa Sion*, who was assisted by *Petrus Paulus Gualterius Aretinus*, & *Marianus Victorius*, *Qui in hoc opere labores perpassi sunt hi fuerunt, Petrus Tesfa Zeon Malexo filius Tecla Haimanot de monte Libano in Monasterio S. Stephani quod in Vaticano positum Ethiopum est, & Petrus Paulus Gualterius Aretinus, & Marianus Victorius Reatinus in hoc & in aliis operibus adjutores mei.* But whatsoever pains they might have taken in publishing this New Testament: they could not succeed well in this Undertaking, as not having any good *Ethiopic* Copies: They declare that they were obliged to re-establish several passages in *The Acts of the Apostles* that were wanting in their *Ethiopic* MSS. by the help of the *Greek* and *Latin*. Mr. *Ludolf*, who hath likewise made this observation, adds, that it is to be feared that they had done the same thing with respect to the other Books of the New Testament: and he insists on this, that he was informed by an *Ethiopian*, that the MSS. Copies of that Countrey differed very much from this printed Edition. *Verendum est* (says he) *ne idem in cæteris Novi Testamenti libris fecerint; quippe Ethiops meus in multis eos differre aiebat ab exemplaribus MSS. patriæ suæ.* Upon the whole matter, this Version of the New Testament that was printed at *Rome*, and reprinted in the Polyglott Bible of *England*, is so little exact, that it deserves no farther consideration.

Ludolf.
Præf. in
Lex. Æth.

This People commonly call their tongue *Chaldaic*, as if it were really the ancient Language of the *Chaldeans* or *Babylonians*, whereas it is very different from it, and comes nearer to the *Arabic* than to the true *Babylonish* Idiom; it might be styled *Axumic*, because it is the Language that was spoken at *Axuma*, when their Kings resided there; but their Court being afterwards removed into the middle of the Kingdom, this tongue began by little and little to be disused, and was reserved to the Learned; inform us that some of them name it *the language of the Books*, because indeed it is only found therein. The dialect called of *Ambura* hath taken place, so that they are esteemed as learned men at this day in *Ethiopia*, who are expert in reading and writing the old *Ethiopic*, which is used in the public Service of the Churches. This may be seen more at large in the History of *Ethiopia* composed by Mr. *Ludolf*.

Ludolf.
Hist. Æth.
l. 1. c. 14.

The *Psalms*, the *Canticles*, and some Chapters of *Genesis*, *Ruth*, *Joel*,
V
Jonah,

Ludolf. ib.
lib. 3.

Jonah, Zephaniah and Malachi, which have been printed in *Ethiopic* are conformable to the *Septuagint*, or rather to the *Coptic Version*, which was made from that of the *LXX Interpreters*. Since the *Ethiopians* or *Abyssins* depend on the Patriarch of the *Coptics*, they agree with them in all matters of Religion. I believe that there are more *Ethiopic Books* in the Library of Mr. *Seguier*, late Chancellor of *France*, than there are at present in all *Ethiopia*; for this famous Magistrate bought a complete Library of an *Abuna*: They join in the Body of their Bible without any distinction, the Books that the Protestants call Apocryphal with the Canonical. Mr. *Ludolf* seems to attribute this to their ignorance or negligence. *Canonicis* (says this Historian) *Apocryphos miscent, incuria an ignorantia incertum*. But there is neither ignorance nor negligence in this particular, for they follow the Custom of the Eastern Churches. Mr. *Ludolf* confesses that a certain *Ethiopian*, named *Gregory*, whom he employed, understood not the meaning of the word Apocryphal; *Gregorius certe fatebatur se tale vocabulum nunquam audivisse*. This shews that those People have the same respect for the Books called Apocryphal by the Protestants, as for all the others: but this is not a proper place to enlarge on this subject; I shall onely observe by the way, that Mr. *Ludolf*, who was prepossess'd with the *Lutheran Confession of Faith*, hath often caused the *Ethiopians* to speak the language of the *Lutherans*.

As for the *Armenian New Testament*, I have little to add to what I have elsewhere related concerning the *Armenian Bibles*. I had some Conferences at *Paris*, in the year 1670. with *Uscan*, an *Armenian Bishop*, who was deputed by his Patriarch in a Council of his Nation assembled anno 1662. to go into *Europe*, to cause their Bible to be printed, and some other Books that were become very scarce. I was informed by him that an entire *Armenian Bible* before it was printed, was sold for at least 500 Crowns. The great diversity that was found among their Copies, was also one of the reasons that induced them to print their Bible, that they might preserve a certain uniformity in the reading of the Holy Scriptures. *Uscan* having procured the Old and New Testament to be printed in *Holland*, passed into *France*, and obtained of the King a privilege to print the Books of his Nation at *Marseille*, where he died; however, they desisted not to continue the same project, which nevertheless was interrupted by reason of the difference that happened thereupon, and which made so great a noise in the World, that the Intendant of *Provence* was obliged to take cognizance thereof. This affair came afterwards even to the King's Council, in which it was determined that they should be permitted to continue the Printing of the *Armenian* Books at *Marseille*, according to the tenour of the Privilege *Armenian* was granted to them by his Majesty. Furthermore, his Edition of *New* Testament, and even of the whole Bible, must needs be exact, *use* this Bishop, who was a learned and judicious Person, brought *along* with him very good MSS. Copies which he hath exactly followed.

It

It were to be wished that an *Armenian* Priest sent from *Rome* in quality of an Apostolic Missionary and Overseer of the *Armenian* Impressions in *France* had not met with so easie a reception at *Marseille*. Although this Priest hath caused some passages in the Writings of the *Armenians*, relating to their Rites, to be corrected, and hath accused his Countrey-men for printing Books that were filled with errors and even heresies; nevertheless, I can avouch that those corrections have not passed into their Bibles, but onely into some Books of their Office; and the Reformation it self is of no importance. Forasmuch as this affair hath been the subject of much talk, I shall here give a brief account thereof, having had in my hands the greatest part of the original Pieces relating to this matter.

This Priest, named *Thomas Herabied*, having resided some time at *Paris* in the Seminary of the foreign Ministers, applied himself to the study of Controversies, and having imbibed prejudicate notions from this sort of study, he vigorously opposed the Printing of the *Armenian* Books, which he pretended to be full of heresies. Mr. *Beausset*, Grand Vicar of his Lordship the Bishop of *Marseille*, Mr. *Amiraut*, Superiour of the Missions of the same City, and even the Judges of the Place were favorable to him. The *Armenians*, on the other side, were vindicated by a learned Doctor of *Sorbonne*, and by Father *Pidou*, a *Theatin* Monk, who was employed in the Missions of the *Levant*; but they could obtain nothing. *Solomon de Leon*, one of the Associates in the Printing, died of grief in the prosecution of this Process, which was of a very great consequence to them; for they caused their Books to be printed in *France*, onely to distribute them afterwards throughout all the places where their Nation was dispersed; but if they should alter them (as it was required) they would run the hazzard of not publishing them, therefore they cannot be suspected of having reformed any thing in their New Testament printed at *Holland*, where they had no Overseer on the behalf of the Court of *Rome*.

Mr. *Morant*, Intendant of *Provence*, received Letters from the King with an order to maintain the *Armenians* in the enjoyment of the Privilege that he had granted to them for the Printing of their Books; his Majesty judged upon the accusations exhibited against *Thomas Herabied*, that he ought not to exercise the function of an Inquisitor at *Marseille*, this quality not being given to him in the Brief of the Congregation de *Propaganda Fide*, that this Brief was onely a pretence for a Pension that had been granted to him by this Congregation; and that for the future *Thomas* might continue his residence at *Marseille*, where he might employ himself to good purpose in the Conversion of the *Turks*; He was only ordered not to assume to himself any other Functions but those that should be appointed to him by his Bishop, without interposing in the Printing of the *Armenian* Books, which *Solomon de Leon* could not finish but in a public capacity, and according to the terms expressed in his Privilege;

Mem. de
Mr. Beauf.
Lett. de
Mr. Amir.
à un Doct.
de Sorb.

vilege; However, *Thomas* forbore not to be always Master of the Press, though the affair was carried on under the name of the Grand Vicar of *Marseille*, as it evidently appears by the *Catalogue of the heresies corrected in the Armenian Breviary*. *Thomas* was the Man that wrote this Catalogue, and presented it in a printed Petition to the Intendant of *Provence*. It would be too tedious to describe all these pretended errors in particular, it is sufficient to declare in general that none of them have any regard to the Bible; and therefore they that have heard of this famous Controversie between the *Armenians* and the Correctors of their Books at *Marseille*, ought to take notice that those Corrections appertain solely to the Books that contain the Ecclesiastical Office of this Nation.

The Petit.
of Thom.
Herab. to
the Inten-
dent of
Provence.

I shall onely produce one of the principal, whence we may easily judge of the justice done to the *Armenians* at *Marseille*, when they were accused for printing Books full of impious doctrines and heresies: It is the third error mentioned in the Petition that was presented to the Intendant in these words, *It is ordained in three places of the Breviary, that they that say Mass on the solemn Festivals, and they that assist at the Sacrifice, ought to adore the Bread before the Consecration*. This Indictment brought against the *Armenians*, and the Correction which was inserted in this place in their Breviary, are altogether unjust. It is true indeed that M. the Grand Vicar of *Marseille* hath endavoured to justify himself as to the Alterations made by him in this passage of the *Armenian Liturgy*, but he will never cause his Reasons to be approved by those who have any knowlege of the Ceremonies of the Eastern Church; for the *Armenian Office* contains nothing as to this particular matter but what is found in that of the *Grecians*, which hath been allowed at *Rome*.

Mem. de
Mr. Beauf.
pour Mr.
l'Ev. de
Mars.

The Dispute is concerning a Ceremony that the Oriental people use with great solemnity, when they carry the symbols of the Bread and Wine to the high Altar from that of the *Prothesis*: This Ceremony was not reformed in the Liturgy of the *Grecians* by those of *Rome*: although *Arcadius* and some zealous Missionaries were of opinion that it should entirely be taken away. *Herabied* imposes on his whole Nation in accusing them for rendring the same honour to the Symbols before Consecration as after, since their practice in this point is not singular. This Correction in the *Armenian Breviary* appeared to be so unreasonable to many Learned men, that they complained the Grand Vicar of *Marseille* had abused the *Armenians*, in leaving out of their Books the words that were found for a very long time in the Offices of the Oriental Christians. He answered, to vindicate himself, that he had given no just cause of offence to the *Armenians*; that his Corrections were confirmed by the General Councils, and by the *Armenian Liturgy* corrected at *Rome* by the Congregation of *de Propaganda Fide*; and in speaking concerning this Congregation, he adds, that it is not probable that persons so learned and so well affected to the Church intended without any necessity to exasperate by their proceedings a People whom they designed

to draw into the Communion of the Church of *Rome*. I am apt to believe that Mr. *Beausset* had at least some seeming reasons to reform the *Armenian Books*. He was surprized by the illustrious Names of those wise and reverend Divines, &c. that compose the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*. For as for the General Councils which he pretends to be favourable to him, he would find it very difficult to produce one to justify his Corrections. He would have acted much more discretely, if he had thereupon consulted the *Euchology* of the *Grecians* printed with the learned Notes of Father *Goar*; but if he had occasion to have recourse to *Rome*, to be resolved in this particular, he ought to reflect on the prudent conduct of Pope *Urban VIII.* who after having caused the *Grecian Euchology* to be examined, would not permit that it should be reformed by the Customs of the Church of *Rome*, according to the opinion of several Divines.

I confess that the Grand Vicar of *Marseille* was not so forward as *Thomas Herabied*, who insisted that the whole Ceremony should be expunged out of the *Armenian Office*; but he contented himself in blotting out some words which seemed to him to make an ill sense. We are informed of this by a Letter that *Herabied* wrote on this subject to a Doctor of *Sorbonne*; wherein he says, (a) *The Corrector having perused my Interpretation hath taken the middle way, leaving the whole Ceremony after the same manner as it is in the Breviary: He hath onely suppressed these words, the Priest adores, and these other words which the Priest pronounces when he shews the Host to the People, blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord.* Mr. *Beausset* hath likewise used his utmost endeavours to vindicate his Corrections in a Memorial that he presented to his Bishop, which he affirms, that *the omission might as well pass for a fault in the printing, as for a correction made by the Bishop's authority.* But it would have been more expedient (in my judgment) not to mutilate a Ceremony which is permitted even at *Rome* in the Office of the *Grecians*, than to declare after it was altered, that these Corrections may be imputed to the Printer: *Thomas Herabied*, who is the true Author of them, and to whom the Grand Vicar onely lent his Name, very much aggravates this pretended Error, chiefly because the *Armenian Priests* give the Blessing to the People with the Bread and Wine which as yet had received but one single Benediction, and esteems this Ceremony as a manifest Idolatry. A learned Doctor of *Sorbonne*, having represented to him in a Letter which he wrote to him, that he was to be blamed for treating his brethren as Idolaters on the account of a Ceremony that ought to be re-

Lett. de
M.P. à Tho.
Herab.
an. 1681.
11. Avr.

(a) *Corrector post Interpretationem meam secutus medium iter reliquit totam Ceremoniam qualis est in Breviario, suppressis tantum verbis, Sacerdos adorat, & istis quæ profert ostendens hostiam populo, Benedictus qui venit in Nomine Domini. Tho. Herab. Epist. ad D. P. Doct. Sorb.*

puted indifferent ; he replied to this Doctor , that it was true indeed ; that the same Ceremony was observed among the *Grecians*, but that they advertized the People that those Elements were not as yet changed into the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ* ; as if the same Advertisements could not be given to the *Armenians* ; the truth is, there was no need of admonishing neither of those Nations, because they very well understood that the Symbols are not consecrated until the Priest hath recited the Prayer which they call, *The Invocation of the Holy Ghost* : They do not adore, but when the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ* is shewn to them immediately before the Communion.

Epist. Th.
Her. ad D.
P. an. 1681.
9. Mai.

We may be yet better able to judge of the reasons alledged by this *Armenian* Priest to correct the Ecclesiastical Office of his Nation in diverse places, if we reflect on this other Answer sent by him to the same Doctor of Sorbonne. (b) *We must (says he) make a distinction between the material or gross Armenians and the formal or obstinate. When the Books are corrected, they are not corrected for the material who are simple and good ; but for the formal , who always dispute against the Church of Rome, from whom every thing ought to be taken away that may lead them into error.* Thus argued this Man, who assumed to himself the quality of *Apostolic Missionary at Marseille*, that he might take an occasion to correct the Books of the *Armenians* which were to be printed there with the King's Privilege I have exhibited this History at length to no other purpose but to make it appear to all the World that these Corrections do not relate to the *Armenian* Bibles. And to the end that all doubts may be removed concerning this matter , I shall here produce the Catalogue of those Heresies that *Thomas Herabied* pretended to have taken out of the *Armenian* Breviary. This Catalogue is inserted in the Petition which he presented to Mr. *Morant* then Intendant of *Provence*.

A Catalogue of the Heresies imputed to the Armenians.

“ The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone. In the Son, of
“ two Natures which he had there is made but one. In three places
“ of the Breviary, it is ordained that they that say Mass on the solemn
“ Festivals, and they that assist at the Sacrifice, ought to adore the Bread
“ before, after the same manner as after the Consecration. O holy,
“ powerfull and immortal God, who wast incarned, who hast mani-
“ fested thy self; who art come, and who oughtest to come ; who wast
“ betrayed, who wast buried, who didst rise again; who didst ascend
“ with Glory to thy Father ; who art come, and hast confided in the
“ Apostles ; who hast manifested thy self on the Mountain of *Tabor* ;
“ who camest to the assumption of the Virgin thy mother. By this means

(b) *Distinguendum est inter Armenos materiales seu crassos, & formales sive pertinaces. Quando emendantur libri, non emendantur pro materialibus qui sunt simplices & boni, sed pro formalibus qui semper disputant cum Ecclesia Romana, & illis debent præcludi omnes viæ erroris.* Epist. Thom. Herab. ad D. P. ann. 1681. 9. Maii.

“ they

“ they attribute all these actions to the Trinity. O mother of God, who
 “ wast never married. He was begotten the onely Son of God the Fa-
 “ ther, that is to say, of the essence of the Father. In four places the Feast
 “ of the Annunciation is said to be on the twenty seventh day of *April*.
 “ In five places it is expressed, that the Church was built on the Faith
 “ of *Peter*. *Barson* and *Maruta*, great Hereticks, were mentioned in the
 “ Breviary as Saints whom they invoke.

If I were not afraid of being too tedious, I could give a particular account of the injustice of the most part of those Accusations; but my design is onely to shew what was reformed in the Books of the *Armenians* printed at *Marseille*. And since this Correction hath respect merely to the Breviary or Ecclesiastical Office, it is sufficient that we have taken notice thereof in general, and produced the Catalogue of the pretended Errors in particular. Forasmuch as Mr. the Grand Vicar of *Marseille*, was onely the instrument of *Thomas Herabied*, because he could not correct Books written in a language which he did not understand; the same *Herabied* complains in a *Latin* Advertisement directed to the said Grand Vicar, that *Solomon*, who was the chief Manager of the Impression, had not punctually followed his Corrections. Mr. *Beausset*, for example, had added after these words, *Sanctus Deus*, &c. these other, *Christe crucifixe. Ille posuit* (says *Thomas Herabied*, speaking of *Solomon*) *haeretico modo, Sanctus Deus qui crucifixus es, &c.* Moreover, the Grand Vicar of *Marseille*, who believed that he had a right to reform in the *Armenian* Books, even the Calendar of this Nation, had changed the 27th of *April* into the 25th of *March*. *Herabied* complained likewise that the 25 of *March* was not inserted in the printed Copy, as it was in the Correction. Lastly, This *Armenian* Priest makes mention of a certain Book entituled *Mastouach*, which also contained (as he says) some Heresies, and among others he declares that, although seven Sacraments were acknowledged in the Preface of this Work, nevertheless there were but six expressed in the body of the Book. The Printer (says he) hath excluded Extreme Unction from the number of the Sacraments. *Typographus Ecclesiae Armenorum excludit e numero Sacramentorum Extremam Unctionem.*

Tho. Her.
monit. ad
Vic. Gen.
Episc. Mas.

Since very little hath been said in the Critical History of the Old Testament concerning *Mesrop*, who invented the *Armenian* Characters, I shall here add some curious remarks appertaining to this matter, which may give us some light at the same time into the knowledge of the first Books that have been translated by the *Armenians* into their Language. There is extant in the King's Library a very large Volume in folio which contains the Lives of their Saints; the above-mentioned Bishop *Uscan*, being at *Paris*, was desired to translate the Life of St. *Mesrop*, which is in this Volume, out of *Armenian* into *Latin*, which he did; and this *Latin* Version is kept also in the same Library. I shall not spend time in rehearsing what is miraculous in the Life of this holy man, which is sup-

Cod. MS.
Arm. Bibl.
Reg.

posed.

posed to have been written by one of his Disciples. It is related therein for example, that the Characters which are used by the *Armenians* even at this day were divinely revealed to him in a Vision, conformably to the *Idea's* that he had already formed of them. It often happens that these Miracles have been afterwards added in the Lives of the Saints by later Writers, who intended thereby to honour their memory : But this is not the Subject of our present discourse. *Mesrop* was born in a place called *Hafecos*, in the Province of *Taren*, his Father, who caused him to be instructed in the Language and Sciences of the *Grecians*, was named *Vardan* : Our *Mesrop* was in favour with this Prince, called *Uram Scafu*, who made him his *Quæstor*, and sent him with his Disciples into *Mesopotamia* of the *Syrians*. *Regis Quæstor factus est. Sic missus Mesrop cum suis Discipulis in Mesopotamiam Syrorum.* He being then very industrious in searching for Characters to express his *Armenian* Tongue, became acquainted with all the Learned men that he could find in that Countrey, and among others with a *Syrian* Bishop named *Daniel*, who was of great reputation : This Bishop promised to delineate the Characters which he so passionately desired, but after they had studied together for a considerable time, their endeavours succeeded not, because they could not invent any Letters that were perfectly suitable to the *Armenian* Language, whereupon (as they say) he prayed to God, who caused an hand to appear to him, writing the wished for Characters on a Stone, after the same manner as he had conceived them in his mind.

Mesrop after this Vision, with the assistance of one of his Disciples called *Ruphan*, formed the *Armenian* Characters by the *Greek*, to which he made them conformable, *Transmutando secundum Armenos sine obliquitate syllabarum ex Græcis.* They resolved from that time to translate the whole Old Testament out of *Greek* into *Armenian*, and indeed they began with the Proverbs of *Solomon*, which was the first Work that hath been written in this Language. This happened under the Empire of *Theodosius* the younger ; *Uram Scafu* being then King of *Armenia*, and *Isaac* Patriarch of that Nation, *Mesrop* communicated to them his new Characters to the great satisfaction of this Prince and the Patriarch, who ordered Schools to be erected, to teach the reading of these Letters. *Mesrop*, travelling into *Iberia*, established Schools there also, and afterward returned into *Armenia*, where he met with the Patriarch *Isaac*, who translated the Writings of the *Syrians* into the *Armenian* Tongue. It may be observed that there were then no *Greek* Books among the *Armenians*, since they were all burnt by *Merusan*; the *Persian* Governours suffered none of them in their Jurisdictions, permitting the *Armenians* onely to read those that were written in the Language of the *Syrians* : This obliged *Isaac* to send *Mesrop* with several of his Disciples to *Constantinople*, where he was very well received by the Emperour *Theodosius* : it was chiefly after that time, that *Isaac*, the Patriarch of the *Armenians*, and the Monk *Mesrop* employed them-

selves in dispersing the Translations of the Bible in the *Armenian* tongue.

Moreover, it is recorded in this same Life, that they sent two of their Disciples, one of them was named *Eznac*, and the other *Joseph*, to *Edessa*, to translate the Holy Scriptures out of *Syriac* into *Armenian* in that Place, for the use of their Nation: *ut ex Syrorum lingua Sanctas Scripturas interpretantes in linguam Armenicam litteras commendarent suæ regionis*. I shall leave it to those that understand the *Armenian* tongue to examine whether the Version which the *Armenians* have caused to be printed in *Holland* be taken from the *Greek* or the *Syriac*. It is certain that this People have composed their Service-Book in *Syriac*; and I have seen a Liturgy in this Language that was written for the use of the *Armenians*. These two Monks abovementioned, who translated the Bible out of *Syriac* into *Armenian*, resided also among the *Grecians*, and having learnt their Language, took pains in translating the *Greek* Books into *Armenian*. Many other Monks were sent likewise into *Greece*, who having acquired a sufficient knowledge in the Language and Divinity of the *Grecians*, interpreted the Books of the Holy Fathers and of the Councils. In a word, the whole Doctrine of the *Grecians* was transferred to the *Armenian* Churches, by the means of the Translations of their Writings that were made in the *Armenian* tongue. Come we now to the *Persian* Version of the Bible.

I do not apprehend wherein the usefulness of the *Persian* Version of the New Testament printed in the Polyglott Bible of *London*, can consist; for besides that it hath no authority, it was not composed from the *Greek* Original, but from the *Syriac* Translation, which the Interpreter hath not always well understood. *Thomas Gravins*, who hath made observations on this Version, which are printed in the VIth Volume of the Polyglott of *England*, is sensible of these defects; nevertheless Bishop *Walton* declares that this is the best of the two Editions of the *Persian* New Testament which are now extant, *Secundam* (says he, speaking of this Edition) *quam omnium antiquissimam & optimam judicavimus*, *tomo quinto hujus operis inseruimus una cum Versione Latina viri doctissimi D. Samuelis Clerici*. But they might have inserted in this Polyglott better pieces than this *Persian* Version, which hath nothing to re-commend it. As for the other *Persian* Translation which is likewise printed, since it is a Work altogether new, it were needless to insist thereon.

I do not believe that the Book written by Father *Ferom Xavier*, a missionary Jesuit, which contains the Life of *Jesus Christ*, ought to be reckoned in the number of the *Persian* Versions of the New Testament. It was printed in *Persian* by the Protestants of *Holland*, with the *Latin* Edit. Interpretation of *Ludovicus de Dieu*, under this Title; *Historia Christi Lugd. Batav. ann. 1639.* *Perfice conscripta, simulque multis modis contaminata*. This Father was the Cousin of St. *Francis Xavier*; he composed this History of *Jesus Christ* at *Agra*, where he then resided, at the solicitation of the Great *Mogol*. It appears by several words which are in the *Persian*, that it was written at

first in the *Portugal* Language, from which it was afterwards translated into the *Persian*. *Ludovicus de Dieu* hath sharply inveighed against this Work, by reason of the Additions taken out of the Apocryphal Books that are inserted therein; upon the whole matter, although this Protestant Divine hath not sufficiently observed the rules of moderation in his Preface and Notes; nevertheless it cannot be denied, but that it would have been more convenient to translate the pure Text of the Gospels into *Persian*, than to publish a mixture of those Gospels and of Apocryphal pieces under the Title of *The History of Jesus Christ*. *Ferom Xavier* hath also compiled another Work of the like nature, entituled, *The History of St. Peter*, which is not written with more exactness than the former.

C H A P. XVIII.

Of the Arabic Versions of the New Testament. An account of an Arabic Translation of the whole Bible which was corrected at Rome by our Latin Edition.

AS there is no Language more generally understood in the *Levant* than the *Arabic*; so we have many Versions of the New Testament in this Tongue, which have been composed by different Sects. The *Coptics*, the *Melchites*, and the *Syrians*, who are divided (as it hath been above observed) into *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, and *Maronites*, all have their *Arabic* Translations of the Holy Scriptures. *Augustinus Justinianus* is the first that hath published any thing in *Arabic*, in an *Hebrew*, *Greek*, *Chaldaic*, and *Arabic* Psalter printed at *Genoa*, in the year 1516. This *Arabic* Psalter was translated from the *Syriac*; the Author mentions in his Observations another *Arabic* Psalter, which he calls *Egyptian* or *Coptic*, and of which he makes use to supply the defects of his Copy stiled by him the *Syrian*, because it was translated out of *Syriac* into *Arabic* by some of that Nation. We find also in our Libraries two sorts of MSS. Copies of the *Syriac* Version of the New Testament. The *Syrians*, in several of their *Syriac* Copies annex an *Arabic* Translation, which was taken from this *Syriac*. There is a Manuscript in the King's Library that contains the four Gospels in *Syriac*, with an *Arabic* Version over against it; nevertheless the Copier hath only transcribed some of the first Sections of the *Arabic* in this Copy, which are found entire in other Manuscripts. These two Versions answer exactly one to another, even in the Rubrics which are expressed in the *Arabic* after the same manner as in the *Syriac*. It could not happen otherwise, since these *Arabic* Translations were made onely for the Instruction of those People who no longer understood

understood the *Syriac* tongue. But that which chiefly deserves to be remarked is, that they have always religiously preserved their ancient *Syriac* Version in the Service of their Church, and that they read the *Arabic* onely in private.

1 There is a like Manuscript of the Epistles of St. Paul, with two columns, in Mr. Colbert's Library, in which the *Syriac* is on one side, and the *Arabic* on the other: this Copy which is written as to what relates to the *Syriac* in those old Characters called *Babylonian*, is more ancient than that of the King's Library. The *Syriac* and *Arabic* do likewise correspond one with the other: and as the Rubrics are not marked in the *Syriac*, so neither are they in the *Arabic*. These *Arabic* Copies of the New Testament may be called *Syrian*, to distinguish them from the others that are used by the *Coptics*. We find in the King's Library a Manuscript of the four Gospels divided into two columns, one of which is in *Coptic* and the other in *Arabic*: And although it is not very ancient, nevertheless it is written in a fair hand. *Erpenius* hath caused to be printed in the year 1616. an *Arabic* Version of the whole New Testament, which he took from a Copy that was written by the *Coptics*.

Cod. MS.
Syr. & Ar.
Bibl. Colb.
n. 4973.

It doth not appear that Bishop Walton hath perfectly understood this matter, when he concludes in speaking concerning the *Arabic* translation published by *Erpenius*, (a) that it is very ancient, because these words in the 6th Chapter of St. Matthew, which have been inserted for a long time at the end of the Lord's Prayer in the *Greek* Copies, are wanting in this; *For thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, for ever*. This onely proves the antiquity of the *Coptic* Version, and not of the *Arabic* translation which was taken from it. Indeed these same words are not found in two *Coptic* Manuscript Copies that are extant in the King's Library, nor in the *Arabic* which answers to this *Coptic*. The same Bishop Walton argues no better in the same place, when he proves (b) the antiquity of the *Arabic* Versions, and even of the *Syriac*, by the seventh verse of the fifth Chapter of the first Epistle of St. John, which is not found in these Translations, nor in the ancient *Greek* Manuscripts; this is (says he) a proof that they are of great antiquity, since this verse, which was not expressed in many *Greek* Copies before the Herefie of

(a) *Antiquissimam verò esse versionem colligere ex eo est, quod Matt. 6. 13. deest doxologia in Oratione Dominica, ut in Vulgata Latina, & in omnibus antiquis Græcis MSS. ut in collationibus nostris codicum Græcorum Novi Testamenti apparet. Nam Orationem illam desisse istis verbis, libera nos à malo, statuunt viri longe doctissimi. Walt. in Bibl. Polyg. Proleg. XIV.*

(b) *Utriusque verò antiquitas ex versiculi illius 1 Joann. 5. 7. absentia colligitur, qui in Syriaca, ut & vetustissimis Græcis exemplaribus, nostro Alexandrino, aliisque MSS. Græcis quos contulimus non reperitur. Quod sanè magnæ vetustatis argumentum est, cum post aamnatam Arii heresim hic versiculus qui tunc id multis exemplaribus desiderabatur, in omnibus suppletus esse videtur. Walt. ibid.*

Arius, seems to have been supplied therein after the condemnation of this Heresie. The Arguments of this Protestant Author shew that he hath not read the *Greek* Copies, the various readings of which he hath inserted in the sixth Tome of his Polyglott Bible; for it is not possible, but that there must be several of them that have no great antiquity; and if he had consulted them, he would have seen that the verse now in dispute, is not found therein: It is so far from being supplied by the *Grecians* (as Bishop *Walton* affirms) in the most part of their Copies after the condemnation of the *Arian* Heresie, that it is in the most modern *Greek* Manuscripts. Moreover, the *Arabic* Versions mentioned by Bishop *Walton* in that place, being composed from the *Coptic* or *Syriac*, we ought to judge of the former onely with respect to the latter, otherwise it might be inferred that the *Arabic* translations are as ancient as the *Syriac* and *Coptic*, which conclusion would be altogether absurd.

Besides those *Arabic* Versions of the New Testament composed from the *Syriac* and *Coptic*, I believe that there are others, which have been immediately taken from the *Greek* by the *Melchites*, or Orthodox, that is to say, by those who follow the pure Doctrine of the *Greek* Church, without adhering to any of the Sects which are in the *Levant*. But notwithstanding the enquiry that I have made to find out the Copies of these *Melchites* written in *Greek* and *Arabic*, I could not discover any of them; nevertheless I judge that there must be some extant, by a *Lecti- nary* taken out of the Gospels, the Epistles of St. *Paul*, and the Psalms, which is in the Library of the University of *Leyden*, wherein the *Greek* is written on one side in large and fair *Greek* Characters, and the *Arabic* on the other: mention is made of this *Lecti- nary* in the Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the same Library, in which it is described in these words; *Series lectionum Græc. Arab. ex Evang. & Psalm. exemplar antiquissimum & octingentis forte, ut è Græco caractere colligebat Scaliger, abhinc annis scriptum.* *Heinsius* hath likewise cited it in his Exercitations, under the Title of a very ancient *Greek* and *Arabic* *Lecti- nary*, in *Lecti- nario Græco- Arabico antiquissimo*. He hath also remarked two passages wherein it differs from the ordinary *Greek*: And it cannot be attributed (in my opinion) to any other but the *Melchites*, who performed their Service in *Greek*. To be better informed concerning this Manuscript, I dispatched a Letter sometime ago to Mr. *Leers*, Bookseller of *Roter- dam*, for Mr. *Le Moine*, Professor of Divinity in the University of *Leyden*, who is a person very expert in the Oriental Languages.

Catal. Bibl.
publ. Lug-
dun. Bat.
an. 1674.
p. 281.
Dan. Hein.
Exer. Sac.
c. 15, & 16.

Mem. de
Mr. le
Moine.
Theol. de
Leyde.

Here follows the Answer that I received from this Divine. " The
" *Greek* and *Arabic* *Lecti- nary* mentioned by Mr. *Simon*, is indeed in our
" Library: It is a very fair Manuscript; however, I do not believe that
" it is so ancient as it is declared to be in the Catalogue of the *Leyden*
" Library, and as *Heinsius* hath imagined. It is true that the *Greek* is
" written *uncialibus literis*, which is a mark of antiquity; but the *Ar-
" bic*, which is in one column and in the same page, appears to me to
" be

" be of a Version and Writing that is not so ancient. It is a Book in
 " large 8°. and hath passed through the fire, for I have found several
 " pages thereof burnt and sing'd; it hath no Title, and it cannot be
 " guess'd neither by the beginning nor by the end, when, for whom,
 " and where it was written, nor in whose possession it hath been. It is
 " not a Lectionary for the whole year; it begins at the Sunday called,
 " *Kuerant* *St. Basil*, and ends at that of our Saviour's Resurrection, and
 " of his apparition in the midst of the Apostles, when he caused *St. Tho-*
 " *mas* to lay aside his incredulity: It is composed of diverse passages ta-
 " out of the Gospels, the Epistles, and the Psalms: It comes very near
 " the Lectionaries of the *Greek Church*; and I am apt to suspect that it
 " was used by some person of the Church of *Alexandria*, not by a *Ja-*
 " *cobite Coptic*, but by a *Melchite*, who, not well understanding the
 " *Greek*, read the *Arabic*, which was the vulgar tongue of the Coun-
 " trey.

This Memorial confirms what I had observed in the Note sent to
 Mr. *Leers*, to be communicated to Mr. *Le Moine*, viz. That the *Greek*
 and *Arabic* Lectionary, which is in the Library of *Leyden*, could not be
 copied out by a *Melchite*, according to the use of his Church, in the
 Public Services whereof the Sacred Books were read in the *Greek* tongue,
 which was no longer understood by the People. That which might
 deceive *Scaliger* and *Heinsius*, as concerning the antiquity of this Manu-
 script, is, that there are certain *Greek* Books written by the *Coptics*, which
 seem to be in those letters called *Unciales*, and which nevertheless are
 not very ancient. It cannot be easily conceived how the *Arabic* column
 could be added to the *Greek* any considerable time after. We must (as
 I apprehend this matter) argue with respect to the *Greek* and *Arabic*
 Copy after the same manner as touching the *Syriac* and *Arabic*, and the
Coptic and *Arabic*. When these People had disused their ancient Lan-
 guages, they composed Versions in their vulgar Tongues for their private
 use, preserving the old Translations in the public Service of their Church.
 This is the cause that the *Melchites*, who hold the same opinions as the
Grecians, have transcribed some of their Copies in two columns, one of
 which is *Arabic* and the other *Greek*. I have likewise found in the King's
 Library two Liturgies of this nature, in which the *Greek* is on one side,
 and the *Arabic* on the other; but those Liturgies, the first of which bears
 the name of *St. Basil*, and the second, that of *Gregory Nazianzene*, seem
 to me rather to have been written by some *Copte Jacobite* than by a *Mel-*
chite.

The first Edition of the Books of the New Testament in *Arabic* is In fol.
 that of *Rome*, wherein the four Gospels are printed in fair Characters, Romæ
 with a *Latin* Version annexed thereto: There are also some Copies of an. 1591
 this *Roman* Edition, in which the *Arabic* is onely inserted. Forasmuch In Typog.
 as there appears no Preface at the beginning of this Book, at least in se. Medic.
 veral Copies that I have seen, we cannot judge of the design of those
 who

who published this Translation ; whether they took it from the *Syrians*, the *Coptics*, or the *Melchites* ; nevertheless it is an easie matter to discover that it is not pure, and that it hath been corrected in some places by our *Latin* Edition : however, I have found it to be sufficiently conformable to the *Arabic* Version which is adjoyned to a *Syriac* Manuscript in the *King's Library* ; this causeth me to judge that it comes rather from the *Syrians* than the *Coptics* ; indeed it doth not agree with the *Arabic* translation that answers to the *Coptic* Gospels, which are likewise in the same Library. *Gabriel Sionita* hath since reprinted those four Gospels in the Polyglott Bible of *Paris*, reforming them onely in some places, which he believed not to be very well expressed in *Arabic* ; the Copy of *Rome*, which he corrected with his own hand, was kept in the Library of Mr. *Seguier*, Chancellor of *France*, and is at present in the possession of Mr. *Piques*, a Doctor of Divinity of *Sorbonne*. The *English*, who have done almost nothing else in their Polyglott, but reprinted that of *Paris*, have also reprinted those *Arabic* Gospels of *Gabriel Sionita*.

We have no entire *Arabic* Version of the New Testament printed separately, but that which was published by *Erpenius* in 4°. at *Leyden*, in the year 1616. Since he hath exactly followed his Manuscript, it ought to be preferred before that of *Rome*, and consequently before that which is in the two Polyglott Bibles. He chose rather (as he declares in his Preface) to retain some rude expressions that were not altogether conformable to the rules of Grammar, than to altar any thing whatsoever in his Edition. *Hoc nunc dico* (says he) *maluisse me quædam quæ non satis eleganter & juxta Grammaticorum præcepta posita videbantur, id est, corruptos Arabismos retinere quàm ut quisquam à me temere quidpiam dicat mutatum, periculum subire.* We find it mentioned (c) in the Catalogue of the MSS. Books which *Joseph Scaliger* bequeathed to the publick Library of the University of *Leyden*. *Franciscus Raphelengius* had inserted in the margin of this Manuscript the various *Arabic* readings which he had taken out of another *Arabic* MS. Copy, in the *Acts of the Apostles*, the *Epistles*, and the *Revelation* ; but these Variations were not printed.

Erpen.
Præf. in
N. T. Arab.

Erpenius attributes this *Arabic* Version as far as it relates to the Gospels, which he believes to have been translated from the Greek, to *Nesulaman*, the Son of *Azalkefat*, by reason of these words which he read in his Copy ; *Absoluta est hujus libri descriptio die decimo sexto mensis Baunæ anni 988. martyrum justorum. Descriptus autem est ex emendatissimo exemplari, cujus descriptor ait se id descripsisse ex alio exemplari emendato exarato manu Joannis Episcopi Cophritæ, qui Joannes dicit se suum descri-*

(c) *Novum Testamentum integrum scriptum in deserto sancto in monasterio D Joannis anno Diocletiani 1059. id est, Christi 1342. In Actis, Epistolis, & Apocalypsi, accuratissime annotata sunt variæ lectiones in alio codice MS. atque ex hoc exemplari suam Novi Testamenti editionem expressit Erpenius. Catal. Biblioth. Lugd. Bat. p. 279.*

psse ex exemplari emendatissimo quod ediderat D. Nesulaman, F. Azalkefati.
 This proves that this *Arabic* Translation of the Gospels proceeds from the *Coptics*, therefore it might have been taken rather from the *Coptic* than the *Greek*: nevertheless it appeared to me to be more conformable to the *Arabic* Version annexed to the *Syriac* Manuscripts, than to that which answers to the *Coptic*. As for the other part of the New Testament, *Erpenius* believes that his *Arabic* Edition of those Books was composed rather from the *Syriac* than the *Greek*; *Cæterum* (says he) *an idem reliquos etiam libros verterit, haud satis sum certus. Non puto! nam & phrasi* *Erp. ibid.*
nonnihil ab Evangeliiis discrepant, & Syro contextui quàm Græco plerisque in locis videntur esse viciniore. But perhaps this whole *Arabic* Translation was made according to the *Syriac*.

However it be, those kinds of Versions are not of so great importance as to deserve a particular examination; for either they have been composed from the *Greek*, from the *Coptic*, or from the *Syriac*; and therefore we may always have recourse to the Originals themselves from whence they have been taken. But since we have not an exact knowledge of the *Coptic* tongue, it would be expedient to publish the *Coptic* translation of the New Testament with the *Arabic* Copy that is conformable thereto, we might by this means in some measure revive the ancient *Greek* Copy from which the *Coptics* have extracted their Version. Besides these Editions of the *Arabic* New Testament, *Raphelengius* hath printed the Catholic Epistles of St. *John* in *Arabic* and *Latin*. *Erpenius* hath likewise published separately the *Arabic* Version of the Epistle to the *Romans*. But these little Works, and some others of the like nature, are become useless, since we have had the whole New Testament in this language.

Kirstenius, who hath set forth Notes on St. *Matthew's* Gospel taken out of the *Greek*, *Arabic*, *Syriac*, *Coptic*, *Hebrew* and *Latin* Copies, makes mention of a Copy much more considerable than all those that we have hitherto described. He assures us that he had an *Arabic* Manuscript in his hands in which the various Readings of the *Coptic*, *Syriac* and *Latin*, were inserted in the margin. *Ne autem sis nescius* (says this Author in his Preface) *è quorum textuum collatione has notas conscripserim, scito me*
adhibuisse manuscriptum Arabicum, ad quod in margine diversæ lectiones
ex exemplari *Egyp- Arab. Syri- Romano sive Latino*
tiaco, سرياني اكو, & scriptæ erant. If *Kir-*

stenius had caused these various Readings to be printed with his *Arabic* Copy, this Work would have been much more beneficial to the public than his Notes on St. *Matthew*, which can be of no great use. *Fran-*
ciscus Janius hath caused to be printed a *Latin* Version of *The Acts of the Apostles* in *Arabic*; he found the Manuscript of this *Arabic* Translation of *The Acts* in the Library of the *Elector Palatin*; and hath added to his *Latin* Interpretation little Notes in the margin; but this Work is not very considerable; besides, the Author doth not seem to be skill-
 full

Fr. Jun.
Præf. in
Verf. Lat.
Epist. II.
ad Cor.
ex Arab.
Rom. an.
1671.

full in this matter; he hath also translated out of *Arabic* into *Latin*, the two Epistles of Saint Paul to the *Corinthians*, from a Manuscript of the same *Palatin Library*: lastly, he observes in his Preface, that the *Arabic* Interpreter of these Epistles is different from the Translator of *The Acts of the Apostles*. *Fuit autem* (says he) *alter quam qui Acta Apostolorum tran-*

tulit, si quid ex comparatione stili possum judicare
Before I conclude this Discourse relating to the *Arabic* Versions of the New Testament, it will not be amiss to add somewhat here (d) concerning an *Arabic* Translation of the whole Bible printed at *Rome*, by order of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide. I have already mentioned it in the *Critical History of the Old Testament*: but since I had then only the *Pentateuch*, which was formerly printed apart, and without the Preface that was afterwards annexed, when the whole Impression was finished, I could not at that time discover what was the design of the publishers of this Work. The Title of this Bible shews at first sight that it was printed to serve for the use of the Eastern Churches; but in my opinion, according to this *idea* it was not convenient to join the *Arabic* with our *Latin* Edition, which can be received only in the Western Churches; much less, to correct the *Arabic* thereby, and to make it conformable to the *Vulgar*; otherwise, we ought to reform on this account, not only all the Oriental Versions, but also the *Greek* Text of the New Testament which does not always agree with the *Vulgar*.

It is to be admir'd that *Sergius Risius*, Arch-bishop of *Damascus*, *Abrahamus Eccbellensis*, *Guadagnol*, and several other learned men who were not ignorant that an *Arabic* Bible after this fashion would be absolutely useless in the *Levant*, should have authorized a design that appeared to be so ill digested; and that which is yet more surprizing to me is, that this Undertaking was performed in the year 1625. under the Pontificate of *Urban VIII.* who would not grant to several Divines assembled at *Rome*, that the *Euchology* of the *Græcians* should be reformed by the Rituals of the *Latin* Church; much less ought this to be permitted (in my judgment) with respect to the *Arabic* Version of the Bible. It will be requisite here to produce the motives of this reformation, which are set down at large in the Preface. It is declared therein, (e) that there having been in the *Levant* a great number of Versions of the Holy

(d) *Biblia Sacra Arabica Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide jussu edita ad usum Ecclesiarum Orientalium, additis è regione Bibliis Latinis Romæ anno 1671.*

(e) *Cum autem Sacrorum Bibliorum editiones præ multitudinem nationum & linguarum multiplices fuerint, editio quoque Arabica olim satius celebris, & verbis ac sententiis admodum integra & perfecta habita est, dum Christiana Religio in orientalibus oris florebat, nec dum hæreses ac schismata maximam earum partem occupaverant. Verum ubi fides & scientia ibi caput imminui, editio quoque illa non modicam jacturam passa est: ita ut pleraque ejus exemplaria perierint, & in paucis quæ superfuerant non pauca errata ac defectus innotuerint, idque ex scriptorum doctorumque virorum inopia, gliscente indies inscitia artiumque bonarum neglectu. Hoc animadvertens Illustrissimus ac Reverendissimus*

Scriptures in different languages, the *Arabic* was highly esteemed in those Countries, as being very pure before the continual growth of Schisms and Heresies but that since these Heresies prevailed, it hath been very much altered; wherefore *Sergius Rissus*, a *Maronite* by Nation, and Arch-bishop of *Damascus*, resolved to supply the urgent necessities of his Countrey-men, especially being incited thereto by some Pastors of the Eastern Churches who had entreated Pope *Urban* to order an *Arabian* Bible to be printed at *Rome*; after it was revised and corrected.

But if it be true, that the Schisms and Heresies of the Oriental Churches have introduced any alterations into the *Arabic* Versions; the same thing may be also affirmed concerning the *Syriac* Version, and even the *Greek* Copy of the Bible; therefore all these Bibles ought to be reformed at *Rome*, as well as the *Arabic*. The faults which they pretend to have happened to the *Arabic* Translations by reason of the ignorance of the Christians of the *Levant*, fall equally on the *Syriac*; why then have they not corrected the *Syriac* Translation used by the *Maronites* after the same manner as the *Arabic* Version? for I believe that it was principally for the benefit of these people, that they undertook to print at *Rome* an entire *Arabic* Bible, revised and altered according to the *Vulgar*: It would have been much better to correct the *Arabic* Version by good MSS. Copies, as the ancient *Greek* Bible of the *LXX*. Interpreters was there printed from an excellent Manuscript: This method was likewise followed, when they intended to publish an exact *Latin* Bible.

It is added in this same Preface (f) that Pope *Urban* committed the management of this affair to the Cardinals of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, who ordered the Archbishop *Sergius* to cause diverse learned men, as well *Laics* as *Ecclesiasties* expert in Divinity and the Oriental

diffimus Præsul *Sergius Rissus Archiepiscopus Damascenus Maronita*... Nationis sue necessitati pro suis viribus opem ferre decrevit, præsertim quia eodem tempore nonnulli Orientalium Ecclesiarum Pastores Apostolicæ Sedi, cui tunc *Urbanus VIII.* felicissimæ recordationis præerat, supplicaverant ut editionem Arabicam recognosci, corrigi, typisque vulgari ad suorum populorum utilitatem in alma urbe juberet. Præf. Bibl. Ar. Lat. edit. Rom. jussu Cong. de Propag. Fide.

(f) Pontifex Eminentissimis ac Reverendissimis Dominis Sacræ Congregationis de Propaganda Fide rem totam commisit. Idcirco prædicti Archiepiscopi *Sergii* partes esse voluerunt plures viros tum Ecclesiasticos tum Laicos Sacræ Theologiæ aliarumque scientiarum Professores, & præterea variarum linguarum, præsertim Arabicæ, Syriacæ, Græcæ & Hebraicæ peritos in suis ædibus congregare, atque unâ cum illis Arabicum Textum corrigere, suæque integritati, quantum fieri posset, restitueret. Anno igitur post Christum 1625.—opus summo cum studio animique ardore aggressi sunt, & exemplaribus quotquot invenerunt Arabicis collectis, ex unoquoque emendatiora ac sinceriora, & quæ ex Hebraicis Græcisque fontibus purius manebant seligentes, corrupta & ea quæ in Arabicis codicibus desiderabantur ex iisdem fontibus & ex Latinis Bibliis vulgatis correxerunt, vel ab integro reposuerunt, atque ita antiquissimæ Arabum genti cæterisque ejusdem linguae nationibus sacros libros, ut olim habuerunt, integros perfectosque quantum fieri potuit restituere conati sunt. In ead. Præfat.

Languages, to assemble at his house, to the end that they might unanimously correct the *Arabic* Version, and re-establish it as much as possibly it could be done in its ancient purity. This was a very good design; but the method that was used to accomplish it will be approved by few judicious persons. Moreover, it is expressly declared, that they consulted in this correction, besides the *Arabic* Manuscripts, the *Hebrew*, *Greek* and *Latin*, by which they reformed and supplied what was altered or wanting in the *Arabic*; The *Hebrew*, *Greek* and *Latin*, might indeed afford very great assistance in chusing the best readings, as it was practised in revising the *Latin* Edition; but they ought not under this pretence to render the *Arabic* conformable to the *Latin*, when it was different from it; however this hath been observed in this Edition of the *Arabic* Version, wherein our *Vulgar* is inserted over against it. It is expressed, for example, in the *Arabic* in the 3d Chap. of *Genesis* v. 15. as in the *Vulgar*, *فهي تسحق* & *ip/a conteret*, and

she shall bruise. We read also in the I. Epistle of St. *John*, Chap. 5. v. 7. the testimony of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, after the same manner as in the *Latin* and in the present *Greek* Copies; which nevertheless is not found in the other *Arabic* Copies. Can it be avouched that the *Arabic* Translation was restored by this means to its primitive condition? To what purpose (g) is the *Vulgar* annexed thereto by an express Order of the Congregation de *Propaganda Fide*? To the end (say they) that this *Latin* Interpretation might serve as a certain rule to distinguish in the *Arabic* the true reading from the false: And it is on this account that the Pronoun in the 3d Chapter of *Genesis*, verse 15. was altered, that it might refer to *the woman*, and not to *the seed*. However, we have reason to doubt that this correction and an infinite number of others of the like nature, are the true readings of the *Arabic* Text.

But after all, if we may believe the Authors of this Preface, they have not so absolutely adhered in their reformation to the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Originals, but that they have rather followed the sense than the words; they declare moreover, that when there happened any diversity betwixt the *Latin* Edition and the *Arabic*, that was not prejudicial to the sense, they have retained the words of the *Arabic* Interpreter, that they might not introduce too many Novelties into a Version to which the Eastern Nations have been so long accustomed. *Illud etiam* (say they) *scias, lector, nos in hac Arabicae editionis correctione, non semper Hebraicae Graecae*

Ibid.

(g) *Sacra eminentissimorum Propagatio jussit in hujus Arabicae editionis impressione, Latinum Vulgatae Translationis textum ubique e regione Arabici Textus opponi tanquam certam regulam ac normam, quâ posset unusquisque & cognoscere & corrigere quicquid vel scriptorum ac typographorum vitio, vel interpretum & correctorum defectu in Arabico textu peccatum fuisset. Ibid.*

que origini, verbo tenus inhaerere, sed antiquiorum interpretum morem imitatos saepe verborum rigore posthabito sententiam tantum retinuisse. Ubi vero inter Arabici Latiniq[ue] textus sententias diversitas aliqua quae veritati minime nocebat appareret, nihil mutasse, sed antiquam interpretationem reliquisse, tum ut illius auctoribus aliquid deferre videremur, tum ne Orientalium populorum aures interpretationi illi jam assuetas importuna novitate offenderemus. But it would have been more expedient not to make any alterations in the Arabic Version. When the Bishops assembled in the Council of Trent determined the Latin Edition to be Authentic, their Decree extended onely to the Western Churches, and not to the Eastern, and therefore we ought to leave to the later their Translations of the Bible after the same manner as they enjoy them; and if we undertake to reform them, it must be done by their most correct Copies; otherwise those people will be apt scornfully to reject those Bibles which they believe to be altered on purpose. And indeed it does not appear that the Arabic Version lately mentioned hath been received or approved in the Levant.

C H A P. XIX.

Of the Version of the New Testament in the Language of the Goths and of that of the Moscovites.

THE Gospels written in the ancient Language of the Goths, and printed not long ago in Holland, ought to be esteemed as one of the best pieces of Antiquity; for this Translation being composed (as is generally believed) by *Wlphilas*, Bishop of this Nation in the IV. Century, we may make good use thereof, as well as of the Syriac and Latin Versions, to re-establish the ancient readings of the Greek Text. *Gothica versio* (says *Saubertius*) *veteris linguae Germanicae antiquissimum omnium quotquot extant stupendum & incomparabile monumentum est.* Mr. Marshall who hath annexed learned Observations to this Gothic Edition, takes notice that *Philostorgius* who was contemporary with *Wlphilas*, makes him the Author of a Version of the whole Bible in the Gothic tongue, except the Books of the Kings, which were not translated by this Bishop by reason of the frequent wars that happened in those times; and of which mention is made in his Work. *Socrates* and *Sozomenus* agree with *Philostorgius* in this particular, when they affirm that this Gothic Bishop was the first that furnished his Countrey-men with Characters and gave them a Translation of the Bible in their Language. He formed these Characters from those of the Grecians, which they resemble, as it appears by the Manuscript, whereof *Franciscus Junius* hath published a Copy in his fair Edition of the Gospels in the ancient Gothic tongue.

Verf. Got.
IV. Evang.
edit. in 4.
Dordr.
an. 1665.
Joann.
Saub. Pro-
leg. in var.
lect. Mart.
Th. Maref.
init. Ob-
serv. de
Verf. Got.

Th. Maref.
ibid.

The antiquity of this Manuscript which is written in Silver Letters, and is reputed to be about a thousand years old, hath caused Mr. Marshall to judge that *Wlphilas* is the Author of this Translation. *Mihi certe* (saith this learned Critic) *argentei codicis vetustas argumentum est non contemnendum hanc versionem aliam non esse quam Episcopi Gothorum illam antiquissimam.* Bishop Usher was also of the same opinion, and concluded (a) that this Version was derived from the Greek Original, because the *Doxology* that is added in the Greek at the end of the Lord's Prayer in *Matt. Chap. 6. v. 13.* and which is not found in the ancient *Latin* Edition, is inserted therein; but it might be taken from the Greek, although it should not contain this addition that is wanting in the ancient Greek and *Latin* Manuscript of Cambridge with which the *Gothic* Version agrees in several passages. This Conformity, if it were exact in all the places where this ancient Copy varies from the ordinary Greek Text, would be a much greater proof of its antiquity; than any thing that could be produced to this purpose; nevertheless there remain sufficient arguments to persuade us that the Greek Manuscript by which the *Gothic* Version was made, differed not so much from this ancient MS. of *Beza*, as the present Greek Copies.

Th. Maref.
Obs. in E-
vang. Got.
ad c. 10.
Matt. v. 42.

Furthermore, this is what Mr. Marshall could not forbear to remark on the 10th Chapter of *St. Matthew*, vers. 42. where the word *water* is read in the *Gothic* Gospel, which is inserted only in the Cambridge Copy and in the Vulgar. *Non dubitant* (says he) *eruditi quin aqua adjecta sit explicationis gratia: sed codex Bezae vetustissimus cujus lectionem noster non raro imitatur, habet ὕδατος ὕδατος.* He makes the same observation on the 8th Chapter of *Saint Mark*, verse 10. where we read *δαλμανδα* in the ordinary Greek, but it is expressed *μαγαλλαν* in the *Gothic* Version, which he believes to have been taken from a Manuscript like unto that of *Beza*, wherein it is written *μαγδαλαν* in the 15th Chapter of *St. Matthew*, verse 39. which reading is confirmed by the *Coptic* Copy *Quod omnium* (says he) *ad rem nostram facit, in codice Bezae vetusto extat μαγδαλαν, à qua lectione noster haud dubie suum transcripsit μαγαλλαν, quam quoque æmulatur interpres Coptus: nevertheless I have read in this passage of St. Mark, in the MSS. of Beza, βεια μαγδα, instead of these words μέγαν δαλμανδα, which are in the ordinary Greek. Moreover, in the 22th verse of the same Chapter of St. Mark we find Bethaniam to Bethany, as in Beza's ancient Copy.*

This *Gothic* Version agrees with the most ancient Greek Manuscripts and with the Vulgar in the 6th Chapter of *St. Matthew* verse 18. where

(a) Notandum Orationem Dominicam Gothicam doxologia illa concludi quæ in vetere Latina Bibliorum editione desideratur, ut ex Græco fonte Gothicam istam Novi Testamenti versionem derivatam esse appareat, & ex ipsius *Wlphile* primæva traductione describam. Jac. Usher. Armach. Epist. ad Jun.

these words ἐν τοῖς παύσειν openly are omitted; neither were they read by St. *Augustin* in the Greek Copies of his time. The *Gothic Interpreter* seems to have joyned together two different readings of the Greek Copies in the 9th Chapter of St. *Matthew*, verse 8. where he hath translated it thus, *they feared marvelling*. It is expressed in the ordinary Greek, ἐθαύμασαν, *they marvelled*, and in some ancient Manuscripts ἐφοβήσανται, *they feared*. He doth not read in the 13th verse of the same Chapter, ἐν μετάνοιαν, *to repentance*, in which he likewise agrees with the most ancient Manuscripts. In the first Chapter of St. *Mark*, ver. 2. he read, ἐν Ἠσαίᾳ τοῦ προφήτου, *in the Prophet Esaias*, as it is written in the *Cambridge Manuscript* and in some ancient Copies; whereas we read in the ordinary Greek Text ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, *in the Prophets*. In the 3d Chapter of Saint *Mark*, verse 21. there is an addition in the *Gothic Version* which is found onely in the *Cambridge Manuscript*, viz. these words οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ λαοὶ, *the Scribes and others*: this is a proof of the great antiquity of this Version, that agrees in many places with these ancient Manuscripts, from which the *Latin Edition* used before St. *Jerom's* time in the Western Churches, was composed.

I shall subjoyn another proof of this Conformity of the *Gothic translation* with the ancient Manuscript of *Cambridge*. It is read in this Manuscript in the 15th Chapter of St. *Mark*, verse 8. ἀναβὰς, *ascending*, and in the *Vulgar* we find, *cum ascendisset*, whereas it is in the ordinary Greek ἀναβοήσας, *crying aloud*; the *Gothic Interpreter* hath render'd it, *being departed*, reflecting (as Mr. *Marshall* observes in this place) on the reading of *Beza's* ancient Copy. We find ἀναβὰς likewise in the Copy of the *Vatican*, this caus'd *Grotius* to imagine (b) that this Manuscript was reformed by our *Latin Version*. (c) If it be so (says Mr. *Marshall*) we must also believe that the Greek Copy from which the *Gothic translation* was taken, and that of *Beza*, which is so venerable by reason of its great antiquity, have been altered by the *Vulgar*: Moreover, the *Coptic Version* confirms this same reading. Since then it were ridiculous to accuse the ancient *Goths* and the *Coptics* for adapting their translations of the New Testament to our *Vulgar Editions*, we ought to have no regard to the objections of some Critics of our Age, who pretend that the Greek Manuscripts that are most conformable to the ancient *Latin Version*, have been corrected by it: For they have not suffi-

(b) Quod Vaticanus Codex habet ἀναβὰς accedit ad ea argumenta quibus moveor ut credam quædam Marci exemplaria Græca ad Latinam Versionem mutata. Grot. Annot. ad c. 15. Marc. vers. 8.

(c) Siquidem id si datur, necessariò consequitur, & exemplar quo usus est Interpres Gothicus primævus, & exemplar illud Bezae ob vetustatem raram adeo celebratum, passim quoque fuisse hanc mutationem: quoniam utrumque hac in lectione consentiunt cum Vulgatæ Versione Latinâ. His insuper adjungi potest translatio Ægyptiaca. Thom. Maref. Obf. in Vers. Goth. ad c. 15. Marc. vers. 8.

tiently considered that the most ancient Greek Copies of the New Testament were very much different from those that are extant at this day, and even from those by which St. *Jerom* revised the old *Latin* Edition, as I have elsewhere proved. Therefore in these old Translations the ancient manner of writing certain words is retained, which the *Grecians* thought fit afterwards to reform, to suit them to their pronunciation and to the *Genius* of their language: Thus we read therein, as in *Beza's* Manuscript and our *Vulgar Capharnaum*, and not *Capernaum*. Many more examples might be produced of this Conformity of the *Gothic* Version with the most ancient Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament, but those that I have related are sufficient to give us a true *Idea* of this matter; and they that desire to be more thoroughly informed thereof, need onely to consult Mr. *Marshall's* Notes.

An entire Bible in the *Sclavonian* tongue was printed at *Ostrovia* in folio, anno 1581. and this is commonly called the *Moscovian* Bible, indeed, the language of the *Moscovites* is a dialect of the *Sclavonian*. There is a Preface at the beginning of this Translation written in Greek, and in the form of a Prayer, it appears thereby that *Constantinus*, who at his Baptism was named *Basilus*, Duke of *Ostrovia*, caused this Version to be printed for the use of all Christians that understand the *Sclavonian* tongue. I shall here produce the express words of this Duke after the same manner as they are printed. Καὶ ὁ Κωνσταντῖνος ἀρχιερέω ὡς ἐν ἁγίῳ βαπτίσματι βασιλεὺς χάρις πᾶσι τοῖς ἡμῶν Θεῷ δὲ Ὁσείβιας Βολινδίας Κιοβίας καὶ περὶ ἐδρῶν Βολινδίας τοῖς ὁ ἀνελεγεμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ καὶ περιλημμένοις ἀδελφοῖς μὴ μόνον καὶ σὰρκι, ἀλλὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ πάσι τοῖς εὐεισκομένοις πανταχῶς ἐν Σλοβα καὶ γλώτῃ, &c. *Constantinus* named also in holy baptism *Basilus* by the Grace of God our Saviour Duke of *Ostrovia*, *Kiovvia*, &c. and Lord of *Volindia*, to the elect and beloved brethren in Christ not onely according to the flesh, but in the Holy Ghost, to all those that are found every where speaking the *Sclavonian* Tongue, &c. The circumstances of time and place are also specified in these words: Ἐν Θεοφυλάκῃ πόλει καὶ ἀρχιερέω ἡμῶν Οσείβιας ἐν Βολινδία ἔτι ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως κόσμου ἐπαρχίῃ τῇ ὁ γυνδικόσῃ ἐνάτῃ καὶ κυεῖς γυνίας χλιόσῃ πενήκοσῃ ὁ γυνδικόσῃ περὶ τῇ that is to say, At *Ostrovia* in *Volindia*, in the year of the Creation of the World 7089. and of the Incarnation of our Lord, 1581.

Since these people follow the *Grecian* Rites, it is not to be doubted but that they have likewise composed their Translation of the whole Bible from the Greek: therefore *Olearius* is mistaken when he affirms that their Version of the New Testament was taken from our *Vulgar*. *Saubertus*, who hath read it, and hath also produced some various readings thereof in his Collection in the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, maintains the contrary opinion; He hath observed that it differs in many places

Joan. Saub.
Proleg. in
var. lect.
Matth.

from the *Latin* Edition; insomuch that he does not question but that it derives its original from the Greek: *Ut dubium mihi non sit* (says this Critic) *Græcum Novi Testamenti textum, à Græcis Christianis acceptum vernacula*

macula sua, Sclavonica nempe, cujus dialectus est Moscovitica, transtulisse Russos. Moreover, this *Moscovian* Version of the New Testament can be of no great use; for it is not probable that it was made from ancient *Greek* Copies, and therefore it is convenient rather to have recourse to the Original and to the ancient Versions, than to this translation.

CHAP. XX.

Of the Version of the New Testament in the Vulgar Greek: Of the Hebrew Translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew, and of the four Gospels which were translated into this language at Rome by the Order of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide.

I Have elsewhere observed that although the *Grecians* have not spoken their ancient *Greek* tongue for some Ages, as being no longer understood by the people; nevertheless they have not composed even to this present time any translation of the Bible in their *Vulgar Greek*. *Spanhemius*, who could not deny the truth of this matter of fact in reference to the Books of the Old Testament, affirms that *these same Grecians have not been so scrupulous with respect to the Greek Original of the New Testament, a Version whereof they have published not long ago in their Vulgar Greek.* He speaks without doubt concerning the New Testament printed at *Geneva*, anno 1638. in two columns, where the ancient *Greek* is exhibited on one side with the title of the *Original*, αὐθεντικόν, and on the other side there is a Version in the *vulgar Greek*, with the title of *new*, νέον. But without offence to *Mr. Spanhemius*, this translation of the New Testament in the *Vulgar* tongue cannot pass for a Work of the *Greek Church*, since it was composed at the solicitation of the Ambassador of the United Provinces, at the Port, by certain *Grecians* infected with *Calvenism*.

M. Spanheim
Lettr. sur
l'Hist. Cr.
du V. T.

The Preface of *Maximus*, who declares himself to be the Author of this Version, and another of *Cyrillus Lucaris*, which are printed at the beginning of the Book, discover the inclinations and the reasons of those that procured it: we find therein a *Panegyric* on the most Illustrious and most Religious Lord of the United Provinces, ἡ ἐκλαμπροτάτων καὶ εὐσεβιστάτων κυρίων καὶ ἀρχόντων τῆς διοικουμένης καὶ ἱεροτάτης αἰσιοκρατίας τῆς Βελγικῆς. *Maximus* entreats them, to cause his new translation of the New Testament to be printed for the Glory of God and the edification of the Church: He acknowledges moreover, that he undertook this Work onely at the instance of *Cornelius Haga*, their Ambassador at *Constantinople*. *Cyrillus* intimates the same thing in his Preface, commending the affection that the Ambassador of the States General had expressed towards the *Greek Nation*.

Nation. This shews that this Translation of the New Testament in the vulgar Greek ought rather to be ranked amongst the Versions of the Protestants, than those of the Christian Societies of the *Levant*.

The Title of these two Greek New Testaments consists in these words, which signifie that the Original is printed on one side, and the Version in vulgar Greek on the other, Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη τῶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς ἡ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκείνη ἐστὶν αὐτῶν. *Maximus of Callipoli*, who composed this Translation, enlarges in his Preface on the necessity that there is of translating the Holy Scriptures into the Vulgar tongue: To this purpose he urgeth those reasons that the Protestants make use of on the like occasions, and even transcribes those errors, acting the part rather of a Controvertist, than of an Interpreter of the Bible: He disputes against those that condemn the reading of the Sacred Books, under pretence that they are obscure, opposing to them the example of the Apostles, who have written their Epistles to Bishops, to Churches, and to all Christians, to no other end, but to be read: He maintains his proposition even by the authority of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*, who being the Head of the Church, hath plainly recommended this reading in his Gospel, when he refers to the Scriptures, καὶ τὰτο (says he) φανεροῦν μᾶς τὸ διδάσκει ἡ κεφαλὴ τῆ ἐκκλησίας μᾶς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός εἰς τὸ δεῖον καὶ ἱερὸν εὐαγγέλιον περὶ σωτηρίας ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς.

He proceeds farther, for he accuses the Pastors of his Church of negligence, and complains of the misery and ignorance of the Grecians who read the Holy Scriptures without understanding them, as not having any translation thereof in their language. (a) When God (says he) delivered the Law to the Children of Israel, he gave it to them in their Vulgar tongue; the Prophets likewise being inspired by God did the same thing with respect to the other Books of the Old Testament. And God hath commanded that all, both great and small, should read the Bible. He adds moreover, (b) that God hath raised up pious men to translate the Sacred Books into all the languages of the World, as St. John Chrysostom shews in one of his Homilies on the Gospel of St. John, wherein he affirms that the Syrians, the Egyptians, the Indians the Persians, the Ethiopians, and an infinite number of other Nations have translated the Holy Scriptures into their languages; this

(a) Ὁ Θεὸς ὅταν ἔδωκε τὸν νόμον τῇ Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὴν αὐτῆς γλῶσσαν, καὶ οἱ προσφῶνται ὁμοίως διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἔγραψαν τὰ βιβλία τῆ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐπέταξεν ἀπὸ ὅλων μικρὰς καὶ μεγάλους νὰ ἀναγινώσκουσιν τὰ βιβλία. *Maxim. Præf. in N. T. Græc. vulg.*

(b) Διὰ μέσων τῶ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφωκίνησεν ὁ Θεὸς ἀνδρας εὐσεβεῖς διὰ νὰ ἐρμηνεύσιν τὴν δεῖαν γραφὴν εἰς ὅλους τὸν κόσμον καθὼς μᾶς τὸ φανεροῦναι ὁ ἱερεὺς Χρυσόστομος εἰς τὴν ἐξηγήσιν τῆς κατ' Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου λέγοντας, καὶ Συριοὶ καὶ Ἀρμένιοι καὶ Ἰνδοὶ καὶ Πέρσαι καὶ Αἰθίοπες καὶ κυρία ἔτερα ἔθνη μετέφρασαν ἐτέτα εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν τὴν γλῶσσαν. *Maxim. ibid.*

he confirms by the example (c) of St. Jerom, who being a Sclavonian translated the Bible into that tongue for the use of his Countrey-men : He produceth also the example of St. Chrysostom, who (as he believes) render'd the Psalms and the New Testament into Armenian.

But this Greek Writer is deceived, when he too faithfully copies out the Books of the Protestants his good friends ; for St. Jerom never translated the Bible, but into *Latin*, and it hath been proved elsewhere, that St. Chrysostom is not the Author of any *Armenian* Version. All these reasons, and several others which he alledges in the same place, were indeed sufficient motives to induce him to furnish his Nation with a Version of the New Testament in their language, if he had not been rather obliged thereto by the *Calvinists* than by the *Grecians*. It is true that there is also annexed at the beginning of his Work a Preface of *Cyrillus Lucaris* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, with this title, Κύριλλος οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης πρὸς ὁρθόδοξοις ἀναγνώσταις. *Cyrillus universal Patriarch to the orthodox Readers*. This Patriarch discourseth at large after the same manner as *Maximus* concerning the reading of the Bibles ; he proves that it ought to be read indifferently by all sorts of persons, men, women and children ; in a word, he repeats the most part of *Maximus's* arguments, to shew the necessity of translating the Holy Scriptures into a language understood by the people. But it is well known to all the World that *Cyrillus* had publickly declared himself to be a *Calvinist*, and he makes no difficulty to own in this Epistle or Preface that the Ambassador of the United Provinces at the Port had a greater share than any other in the design of this late Translation of the New Testament into the *Vulgar Greek*.

However it be, *Maximus*, who is the Author thererof, (d) calls God to witness his sincerity, that he hath neither added nor diminished any thing in the Text, which he hath translated into his Mother-tongue with all possible fidelity. Indeed this Interpreter makes it appear in the very first words of his Version, that he hath adhered to the Letter of his Original ; for he renders these words Βίβλος γενέσεως, thus, βιβλίον τῆς γενέσεως, *The book of the generation* ; and adds in the margent, ἤγεν γενεαλογία, *that is to say the genealogy*. If he had been less exact, he might have made use of the word *Genealogy* in his Translation, which explains the sense of the two words in the Text. He observes this same method in diverse other places, where he chuseth rather to supply the obscurity of the

(c) Ὁ ἄγιος Ἱερώνυμος διὰ τὰ ἐν Ἰλλύειοις μετρημένους τὴν θεῖαν γραφὴν εἰς τὴν ἑδικὴν τῆς γλώσσης τὴν Ἰλλυρικὴν διὰ τὰ γενικῶς οἱ συμπαιδιῶται τὰ μεγαλεῖα τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Χρυσοστόμου διωκτοῦς ψαλμοῦ καὶ τὴν νεὰν διαθήκην μετρημένους εἰς τὴν γλώσσαν τῆς Ἀρμενίων. Maxim. ibid.

(d) Εἰς τὸ τοιοῦτον ἔργον ἔχοντες μάλιστα τὸ θεὸν ὅτι ἐδὲ ἀπερδείξαμεν, ἐδὲ εὐχαρίσαμεν, ἀλλὰ μὴ καρτερῶ συνειδέσθαι καὶ κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν μας ἐξηγήσασθαι τὸν τῆς θείας γραφῆς εἰς τὴν ἑδικὴν μας γλῶσσαν. Maxim. ibid.

Greek Text by certain little Notes in the margent, than to add any thing in his Version. As for example, in the 11th verse of the same Chapter of St. Matthew, where he translates according to the ordinary Greek, *Kai Iōsias ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰεχονίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ καιρὸν ὅτε ἐμετασπορεύοντες εἰς τὴν Βαβυλῶνα*, and *Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren*, about the time they were carried away to Babylon. He inserts these words in the margent by way of illustration, *ἦγεν δὲ Ἰωακείμ καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ἰωακείμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰεχονίαν εἰς τὸ καιρὸν*, &c. that is to say, *Joakim and his brethren, and Joakim begat Jechonias about the time*, &c. He was very cautious in placing these words in his Version as some modern Translators have done. In the 19th verse of the same Chapter, where we read in the Greek, *μὴ δέλων αὐτὴν ἐπαγγεῖλαι*, and in the Vulgar, *& nollet eam traducere*. Maximus hath expressed it thus in his Translation, *μὴ δέλοντας νὰ τὴν φανερώσῃ*, being not willing to make her manifest, that is to say, *νὰ τὴν πομπέῃ*, to defame her, as he adds in the margent.

He preserves in his Version certain words that are in a manner canonized; he useth for example the word *γεγραμμένοι*, *Scribes*, and at the same time refers to this Note in the margent, *Οἱ γεγραμμένοι ἦσαν διδάσκαλοι ὅτε ἐξηγῶσαν τὴν γραφήν*, *The Scribes were Doctors that expounded the Scripture*. For the same reason he retains the word *εὐαγγελίζονται*, in the Text of his Version, *Matt. 11. 5.* and adds in the margent, *ἦγεν διδασκόντας καλὰ μαντάτα*, that is to say, *good tidings are declared to them*. He hath likewise preserved the *Latin* words which are in the Original, explaining them in the margent by others that are better known, as in the 22d Chapter of St. Matthew, ver. 17. where we find in his Version as well as in the Greek Text *κῆνον*, *tribute*, being a *Latin* word; he hath placed in the margent *τὸ καρετζιον*. The modern Grecians have taken this word from the *Turks*, which signifies the ordinary tribute that they pay to them. Moreover, he hath retained in his Version, in Chap. 27. verse 27. of the same Gospel, the word *παλάτιον*, *common-hall*, and hath put in the margent *παλάτιον τῶ ἡγεμῶνος*, *The Governor's Palace*. In the 6th Chapter of Saint Matthew, verse 11. he renders these words very accurately, and according to the letter, *τὸ ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸ ὀπίσπον*, by these, *τὸ ψωμί μας τὸ καθημερινόν*, *our daily bread*. He follows as much as possibly he could, the phrases and idioms of his Original, except in some places, where he thought himself obliged to explain that by several words which was expressed by one. Thus, for example, in the 17th Chapter of St. Matthew, verse 18. where it is in the Greek *ἐπέλιμνον*, *rebuked*, he hath inserted these words in his Version, *ἐπέταξε μετὰ θυμῶν*, *he commanded with anger*, to denote the force of the Command, which seemed to be accompanied with somewhat of heat or passion.

Moreover, he takes away the ambiguity of certain expressions by annexing little Notes in the margent. Thus, in the 7th Chap. verse 23. of St. Matthew, where he hath translated conformably to the Greek Text, *καὶ ἐπεὶ οὐκ εἶπες οὐκ ἐγνώρισά σε*, *I never knew you*, he adds in the margent, *οὐκ εἶπες*

οὐκ ἠγάπησα ποτὶ, that is to say, *I never loved you*; as if the Verb which according to the Grammatical sense signifies, *to know*, imported in this place, *to love*. He seems to be less exact in the 26th Chapter of *St. Matthew*, verse 26. where instead of the word εὐλογῆσαι, *having blessed*, which is in the *Greek*, he hath rendred it in his Version, ὡς ἂν εὐχαρίσῃσι, *after having given thanks*, which nevertheless perfectly expresses the sense of the Verb εὐλογῆσαι, and indeed we read εὐχαρισῆσαι in some *Greek Copies*. But he hath retained the Verb εὐλόγησι, *blessed*, in the 6th Chapter of *St. Mark*, verse 41. and at the same time explains it in the margent by these words, εὐχαρίσῃσι καὶ ἐδόξασι, *he gave thanks and praised*. He doth the like also in the 8th Chapter of the same Gospel, where he makes use of the Verb εὐλόγησι in his Version, as it is in the Original, and sets down in the margent ἦσαν εὐχαρίσῃσι καὶ ἐδόξασι με προσευχῇ, that is to say, *he gave thanks and praised with prayer*: He could not give a more just explication of the Verb εὐλογεῖν, which signifies in these places to recite the Benedictions or Praises after the manner of the *Jews*, who likewise call these Benedictions, *giving of thanks*. In the 13th Chapter of *The Acts of the Apostles*, verse 2. where it is in the *Greek* λειτουργήσαντες ὁ αὐτὸς πρὸ κυρίου, *Maximus* hath translated it, καὶ ὡς ἂν ἐπρέβουν ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου, which exactly answers to our *Vulgar*, wherein it is read, *ministrantibus autem illis Domino*, as they ministred unto the Lord. He hath also inserted these words in the margent, κηρύττοντες τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, *preaching the Gospel*, as if nothing but Preaching were meant in this place; but this sense is too much limited.

It may be affirmed in general, that the Translation of this *Grecian* Interpreter is one of the most exact, and most judicious that have been composed in this later Age; It sufficiently expresses the style and scope of the *Greek Original*; nevertheless there are certain passages therein where some words are supplied to render the sense more clear, and those are included within two Crotchets or little hooks; As for example, in the first Chapter of *St. John*, verse 3. πάντα δι' αὐτὸ ἐγένετο, we read in his Version, ὅλα [τὰ περὶ γράμματα] διὰ μέσον [τῷ λόγῳ] ἐγέννηκαν. *All things were made by the Word*: Where the expression of the *Greek Text* is too concise, he sometimes makes it more intelligible and perspicuous, by adding some words, because he believed that the sense could not be otherwise interpreted, this appears in the 8th Chapter of *Saint John*, verse the 15. where he translates these obscure *Greek words*, τὴν ἀρχὴν ὃ, π καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, by these others which are clear and make a good sense, ἐκεῖν· ὃ ὅτε οὐκ ἔλαλῶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς, *I am he who spake unto you from the beginning*. If there are any words in the *Greek* that admit another interpretation besides that which is commonly attributed to them, this Translator shews the true signification in the margent: As for example, in the 6th Chapter of *The Acts*, verse 1. where he hath translated conformably to the *Greek Original*, ἐρρόνυσον οἱ Ἕλληνας εἰς τὰς Ἑβραῖους, *the Grecians murmured against the Hebrews*; he adds this observation in the margent, Ἐλ-

ληνισὶς ἐλαῦδα καλεῖ τὸς Ἑβραῖους τὸς διαλεγόμενους ἑλληνισί· Ἑβραῖους δὲ τὸς καὶ τῶν γένει καὶ τῶν γλώττων ὄντας. He calls those Hebrews that spake Greek Hellenists; and he calls those Hebrews, who were of that Nation and spake the Hebrew tongue. Lastly, Maximus sometimes describes the various Readings of the Greek Text in the margin of his Book, nevertheless he doth this but seldom. Thus, in the 19th Chapter of St. John, verse 14. where he translated according to the ordinary Greek, ἕως ἡμέρας ὥραν, about the sixth hour; he also puts in the margent, γερουσία καὶ ἕως τρίτης ὥρας καὶ Μαρκ. ιε. κα. It is written in some Copies, about the third hour, as in Saint Mark, ch. 15. v. 25.

Epiph.
Hær. 30:

What we have already related is more than sufficient to shew the nature of the Version of the New Testament composed in our time by Maximus in the Vulgar Greek, upon the solicitation of the Ambassador of the United Provinces at the Port, which was approved by Cyrillus Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople. Let us now say somewhat concerning the Hebrew Version of the New Testament, or rather, of the Gospel of St. Matthew alone, because it is not necessary to insist on Hebrew Translations that have been made by Christians: neither have I any thing to offer touching an ancient Hebrew Version of the Gospel of Saint John and of The Acts of the Apostles, which the Jews of Tiberias preserved in their Archives in the time of St. Epiphanius; for this Father who makes mention thereof never saw it, he only reports what he was informed as to this matter by certain Jews who had embraced the Christian Religion. I should not here discourse even of the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew, but that it hath made some noise in the World, as if it came near the Original of this Evangelist; nevertheless it is certain that is a counterfeit Piece invented by a Jew, an Enemy of the Christians.

Sebastianus Munsterus is the first that hath published a Gospel in Hebrew of which there have been several Editions as well at Basil as at Paris. Jean du Tillet, Bishop of St. Brioux (e) afterward, set forth a new Edition in the year 1555. different from the former, being taken from a Copy which he brought out of Italy into France; whereto the Latin Version of Learned Joannes Mercerus is annexed. The Edition of Munsterus is in bad Hebrew, full of Solecisms and Barbarisms; moreover, he declares that he hath not published it after the same manner as it was at first composed in Hebrew, because his Copy was very defective, and he was obliged to supply what was wanting therein: Bishop du Tillet,

(e) Anno superiore profectus in Italiam inter multos ac varios libros hoc Divi Matthæi Evangelium Hebraicum reperi, quod equidem ut non ausim adfirmare de eo quod sua ille lingua divinitus conscripsit expressum; ita ut ex eruditorum hominum & Cisalpinorum testimonio atque predicatione possum asserere à Rabbinica dictione plurimum abesse, eaque conscriptum orationis puritate quam nulla post desolatam hanc gentem scripta redeant. Longè enim aliud ab eo est quod nobis Munsterus plerunque barbarum & ineptum oberust. Hoc nitidius est, præter quàm quod phrasés Hebræas multis in locis dilucidiores facit. Joann. Till. Epist. ad Carol. Lotharing. Cardin.

on the contrary, extolls his Copy as being pure and free from Rabbinical phrases; nevertheless, he durst not avouch that St. Matthew is the Author thereof; he despises that of *Munsterus* as a Rabbinical Work: But whatsoever commendation he may give to his Copy, yet it is not ancient; indeed the *Jews* who composed this Gospel in *Hebrew* hath not written it in the *Hebrew* of the *Rabbins*, but in the ancient, that is to say, in the Language of the Sacred Books; however *Mercerus*, who was a competent Judge, affirms that though the style be sufficiently pure, and not very far from that of the Writers of the Old Testament; nevertheless some *Rabbinisms* are found therein. *Utut sit* (saies this able Critic) *hæc satis purè scripta, si diligenter evolvas, nec à Veteris Instrumenti nitore procul abesse; etsi nonnihil Rabbinismi interdum adjunctum comperies.*

Joan. Mer.
Præf. in
Verf. Lat.
Evan. Heb.

The Copy of *Munsterus* is really written in such a style as Bishop *du Tillet* calls barbarous, divers words being read therein which are not to be found in the purity of the *Hebrew* Tongue; there are also many *Solecisms* and barbarous Expressions proceeding either from the Translator or from *Munsterus* who revised it. I have a part of this *Hebrew* Gospel in Manuscript which is more exact and in a better style than even the Copy of Bishop *du Tillet*; there are certain Verses written in *Hebrew* at the beginning of this Manuscript which are evident proofs of the hatred that the *Jews* bear to the *Christians*; and we may thereby discover that they have onely translated this Gospel with a design to refute it: the title is expressed in these words (f) *This is the Book of Jesus called the Gospel which was composed by Matthew touching that which relates to Jesus of Nazareth, It ought not to be believed; because it is a forgery and a lye.* It doth not begin as the Copy of Bishop *du Tillet* with these words, *אלה ספר תולדות ישו* — *תולדות ישו*, which are in imitation of the Old Testament, but with these that answer better to the first words of the Gospel of St. Matthew, *זוה ספר תולדות ישוע*. The *Jewish* Interpreter hath translated it from the *Latin* Edition, or rather from some *Italian* Version which was composed from the *Latin*, for he writes the name of Saint *Matthew* after the manner of the *Italians*, *Matteo*, and he hath likewise read *Evangeliò*. I should be ashamed to examine this Work in particular which deserved not to be brought to light. It is to be admired that some learned Critics should have taken the pains to mark the various Readings thereof and to relate them seriously. Forasmuch as all antiquity believed that Saint *Matthew* wrote his Gospel in *Hebrew* for the use of the *Jews* of *Palestine*; this was sufficient to give reputation to this new Piece that was published in *Hebrew* under the name of St. *Matthew*: ne-

Ex Evang.
Matt. Ebr.
MS.

(f) זוה ספר ישוע. וקידן איתו בלעו אבנגליו שריבר מטא מעיניו ישו
הנרצרי ואן להאמן בו כי כלו שקר וכזב.

vertheless

Joan. Mer-
cer. ibid.

vertheless *Mercerus* who translated it into *Latin* to content the *Bishop du Tillet* was very wary in giving it out that it was the true the Copy of this Evangelist, or even that of the *Nazareans*. *Quod si* (saies he) *Hebraicum exemplar ne non Matthæi authenticum esse tibi persuadeas te quispian movet, cito nè Nazaræorum quidem, quo usus Hieronymus, & quod plerique Syriacum fuisse credunt, αὐτόγεγον, meo judicio fuisse.*

The four Gospels translated into *Hebrew* by *Joannes Baptista Jonas*, a converted *Jew* and Professor of the *Hebrew* Tongue in the University of *Rome* were printed in that City at the charge of the Congregation *De propaganda Fide*, in folio, anno 1668. This *Jew* dedicated his Work to Pope *Clement IX.* and declares in his Epistle Dedicatory, (g) that the dignity and holiness of the Christian Religion required that the Gospels which are extant in *Arabick, Syriac, Greek and Latin*, should also be read into *Hebrew*, which is the Tongue wherein almost all the Books of the Old Testament were written; he adds farther, that his design is likewise to repress the insolence and impiety of the *Jews* who have altered and corrupted the most part of the passages in which mention is made of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*. Moreover, this *Jewish* Author hath annexed to his Work a Preface in *Hebrew and Latin*, wherein he not onely takes notice of the several Editions that have been published of the *Hebrew* Gospel of *St. Matthew*, but also of a Manuscript Copy of this same Gospel which was translated into *Hebrew* by a *Jew* named, *Scem Tob Siphrut*. He assures us that this Version entituled אֲבִן בִּיטוּן, *A touchstone*, is written in bad *Hebrew*, and that certain Objections against the Gospel are inserted at the end of every Chapter, after the same manner as they are at the end of the Edition that was made at *Paris* in the year 1655. so that we may judge from thence that this Manuscript differed not from the Edition of *Jean du Tillet*.

It may be perceived in this Preface, that *Jonas the Jew*, though he embraced the Christian Religion, had not altogether forgotten the manner of writing used by the most part of his Countrey-men, at least by those that applied themselves to the study of the *Cabbala*; for he *Cabbalistically* explains the word *Gospel*, which he writes thus אֲבִן גִּילְיוֹן, *Even ghilion*, (b) and which signifies (according to his opinion) a stone

(g) Planè videbatur Christianæ Religionis dignitati sanctitatisque necessarium, ut hæc primaria ejus instrumenta, Arabicis, Syriacis, Græcis, atque Latinis vocibus jam expressa etiam Hebraicis exprimerentur, cum præsertim Instrumenti Veteris omnes fere libri Hebraicâ Linguâ conscripti fuerint. Deinde iniqua & impia Hebræorum mens in Christum cujus, gloriæ invidentes omnia fere testimonia quæ de eo habentur, mutatis vel vocibus vel significationibus, corrumpunt—Hac autem Evangeliorum versione in verum Hebraicum sermonem tantæ audaciæ occurrimus. Joann. Bapt. Jon. Epist. ad Clem. IX.

(h) Even ghilion, quod sonat petram manifestatam, quia nova lex intra legem veterem abscondebatur, atque id à Deo significatum fuit in monte Sinai, cum decem mandata duabus tabulis ex petra commissa fuerint, quo significaretur utraque lex, nova & vetus, Joann. Bapt. Jon. Procem. in IV. Evang. Hebr. & Lat.

manifested,

manifested, because (saies he) the New Law was hidden within the Old, which was typified on Mount *Sinai*, when the Ten Commandments were written in two Tables of Stone that signified the two Laws, the Old and the New. He subjoins in the same place other allegories of the like nature, from whence he pretends to prove the coming of the *Messias*, always alluding to the Stone, which (as he believes) is contained in the word *Evangelium*, *Gospel*, and concludes thence by a way of arguing altogether peculiar to the *Jews*, and becoming a *Cabalist* rather than a Christian, that that which he observes in this place happening in the time of the *Messiah*, St. *Matthæw* wrote his Gospel and called it in *Hebrew*, *Even ghilion*, that is to say, a stone manifested. *Concludimus* (saies he) *cum hoc fuit tempore Messia, St. Matthæum historiam Evangelicam quam Hebraice scripsit nominasse Even ghilion petram manifestatam*. Afterwards he accuseth the ancient Rabbins for perverting in the *Talmud* the true signification of the word *Evangelium* in not reading it with the letter ב, *beth*, but with a ו, *vau*, as also in reading *avon-sin* instead of *Even*; Thus R. *Mehir* called the Gospel a *sin manifested*, and R. *Jochanan*, an *injury manifested*. But let us leave these extravagant conceits of the Rabbins. Furthermore, this Translation is written in pure *Hebrew*, and was composed from our *Latin* Edition: it begins with these words, ספר תולדות ישוע משיח.

C H A P. XXI.

Of the Latin Versions of the New Testament that have been made from the Greek Text in these later times: Of Laurentius Valla and Jacobus Faber Stapulensis: Of Erasmus's Version in general, and of those who have opposed it.

THE study of Learning was no sooner seen to flourish in *Europe*; but the ancient Interpreter of the Church began to be despised as those that had any knowledge in the *Greek* and *Latin* tongues; especially in *Italy*, where they pretended to be more polite than in any other part of the World; And indeed, we are much obliged to the *Italians* on this account, that they were the first that took pains in expelling Barbarism from *Europe* where it was predominant for many Ages; But their politeness ought not to extend so far as to reform with too much liberty the style of the ancient *Latin* Translation; they ought to have considered that in altering the old phrases to render them more elegant or more *Ciceronian*, they thereby often obstructed the sense; since by their Critical niceties they presumed to correct in the Sacred Books that which the custome of so many Ages had approved and authorized: Moreover, the Word of God cannot be too literally translated, and it

is

is convenient in these sorts of Versions to make use of the most simple expressions, it being sufficient to preserve the true and genuine sense of the words. Saint *Augustine* hath judiciously observed, that the ancient Interpreter chose rather to translate the proper sense of the Original, than to speak good *Latine*. *Maluit pius Interpres minus Latine aliquid dicere, quam minus propriè.*

August. in
Pl. 50.

Laurentius Humfredus, in a Treatise composed by him concerning the true manner of Translating Authors as well profane as sacred, could not forbear to reprove the *Italians* for taking too much liberty, when they designed to cause the Holy Writers to speak the Language of *Cicero*, by altering certain words and expressions that were in a manner consecrated to the use of the Church: He more particularly reprehends the eloquent *Longolius*, who in this particular had followed the Genius of the *Italians*. *Sic enim ferè (saies this wise protestant) Longolius generoso mentis impetu ad optima quæque tendens, sed transversum non satis sano Italarum consilio ad hanc perniciosam prophanitatem penè abreptus Evangelium Ciceronianum conatus est obtrudere.*

Laur.
Humfr. de
rat. interp.
lib. 1. E.
rasm. A.
pol. adv.
Petr. Sur.

Laurentius Valla, born of a noble Family in *Italy*, may be esteemed as one of the first that was agitated with this Spirit; he would have made a new Translation of the Bible (as *Erasmus* hath remarked) or at least of the New Testament, if the Pope had not diverted him from this design; but he could not hinder him from publishing his Critical Observations on the ancient *Latin* Interpretation. Since he wrote in a time of profound ignorance as to what relates to the *Latin* Tongue, he insisted on several minute circumstances of Grammar, the recital of which would be unseasonable in these times. He chiefly undertakes to examine whether our Interpreter hath exactly render'd the propriety of the *Greek* words by others in *Latin*; he reproves him for example for translating the word *λαοι* by *plebem*, whereas (as he saies) he ought to have expressed it *populum*: However, there are divers words whereto Divines have appropriated significations which it would be difficult to take away, because they have been authorized by a theological use; thus the Verb *λατρεύειν*, which is more frequently applied in profane Authors to signify the honour given unto men than the Worship that is due to God, hath been restrained by Divines to the later sense; nevertheless *Valla* could not endure this custome; he replies to those who objected to him, that Divinity was not subject to the Rules of Grammar; that it ought to preserve the use of every Tongue: *Ego dico illam debere servare etiam cujuslibet linguae usum*: For what is more contrary (saies he) to reason, than to corrupt a Language that is used, and to cause it not to be understood by those to whom it is spoken? *Nam quid stultius quàm linguam qua uteris velle corrumpere, & committere ne ab iis apud quos loqueris intelligaris?*

Laur. Val.
Annot. in
N. T. c. 4.
Matth.

Sometimes he corrects our *Latin* Version by the Original, as in the 10th Chapter of the Gospel of St. *John*, vers. 29. where we read even at this

this day, *Pater meus quod dedit mihi majus omnibus est*, That which my Father gave me is greater than all. He affirms that it is a fault of the Copier, or of some too audacious Critic, and that it ought to be translated according to the Greek, *Pater meus qui dedit mihi major omnibus est*; My Father which gave them me is greater than all. However, he doth not always succeed in his corrections, because a person that understands only the Greek and Latin Tongues is not sufficiently qualified to judge of the Readings of the New Testament, unless, besides these, he hath some knowledge of the Hebrew and Syriac: therefore he fell into a gross error when he intended to alter from the Greek the word *Cedron* (a) which is in our Vulgar in the 18th Chapter of St. John, verse 1. as if it ought to be read *Κέδρων*, in the Greek, and *Cedrorum* in the Latin. Neither doth he seem to be very expert in the Greek Tongue, when he asserts in his Note on the 1st Chapter of the Epistle of Paul to Titus, vers. 5. that it ought not to be translated as it is in the Vulgar, *per Civitates*, in the Plural number, because we find in the Greek, *πόλιν*, *civitatem*, in the Singular: But *καὶ πόλιν*, signifies *in every city*; and this is to be understood by these words in the Vulgar, *per civitates*, that is to say, *per singulas civitates*.

Laurentius Valla accuses the ancient Latin Interpreter on better grounds and with a greater shew of reason in the 10th Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, vers. 34. where we read, *nam & vinctis compassi estis*, for ye had compassion on them that were bound; whereas according to the ordinary Greek it ought to be translated, *vinculis meis compassi estis*, ye had compassion on me in my bonds. He admires (b) that this corruption is tolerated in our Vulgar, because a proof is thereby taken away, which evidently demonstrates that this Epistle was written by St. Paul. But why will he not grant that the alteration was rather made in the Greek than in the Latin? Indeed there are some very ancient Copies that have *δεσμῶν*, *vinctis*, and it is as easie to change *δεσμῶν* into *δεσμοῖς*, as *vinculis* into *vinctis*. We read in the Latin of the ancient Manuscript of St. Germain des Prez, *vinculis eorum consensistis*. He approves the Latin Interpretation in his Note on the first Epistle of St. Peter, chap. 5. v. 2. where the Greek word *ἐπισκοπεῖτε*, is render'd *providentes*; and yet reprehends St. Augustin at the same time for attributing the signification of *Superintendens* to the word *Episcopus*: Miror (says he) *Augustinum dicere Episcopos interpretari Latine Superintendens*.

Id. ibid. ad
cap. 5. Ep.
I. Petr.
vers. 2.

(a) Non Hebraicum nomen proprium torrentis vel alterius rei videtur esse Cedron, sed Græcum apposito articulo plurali *Κέδρων*, ut transferendum fuerit, trans torrentem cedrorum. Laur. Vall. Annot. in Nov. Test. cap. 18. Joann.

(b) Pudendum est vicem Latinorum qui ita sacrorum librorum veritatem corrumpi permiserunt, ne dicam corruerunt. Nam hic locus præcipue probat hanc Epistolam esse Pauli, cum dicat, *compassi estis vinculis meis*, non *vinctis*, *δεσμοῖς* meis. Laur. Vall. Annot. in Nov. Test. cap. 10. Epist. ad Hebr.

He inveighs more against the Scholastical Divines whose Barbarism he cannot endure ; and this obliged *Erasmus* , who was the first that published those Remarks on the New Testament, to prefix an Epistle at the beginning by way of an Apology ; he replies to those who objected, That (c) *Laurentius Valla* was a Slanderer, who never spared any ; that it is not Slandering, not to be of the same opinion as others in matters of pure Learning ; and as for the Divines, he adds *Nova Theologorum dignitas, si solis illis licet barbarè loqui*. But after all, this Epigram that was published after the death of this Critic plainly shews that he had made himself formidable to the whole World, and that he designed to reform not onely the ancient *Latin* Interpretation , but even the Language of all mankind.

*Nunc postquam manes defunctus Valla petivit,
Non audet Pluto verba Latina loqui.
Juppiter hunc Cæli dignatus honore fuisse ;
Censorem linguæ, sed timet ipse suæ.*

*Censorious Valla's gon to th' Stygian shore,
And Pluto-durst in Latin speak no more.
Among the Gods Jove would his name enroll ;
But that he fear'd he might his Speech controll.*

Jacobus Faber Stapulensis, who had some knowledg of the Greek tongue, caused his Commentaries on the four Gospels to be printed at *Meaux*, in the year 1522. in which he reforms the ancient *Latin* Edition with a great deal of liberty ; his method is to exhibit at first the Text of this Edition, and to explain it, correcting at the same time those passages, that he believes to be ill translated. Since he principally takes the Greek for his Guide, he hath added Asterisks and Obelisks to mark what is redundant or what is wanting in the *Latin* after the same manner as in the Greek. We have likewise the Commentaries of this Author on the Epistles of *St. Paul* printed at *Paris*, anno 1531. nevertheless he declares, that he had finished them in the year 1512. in the Abbey of *St. Germain des Prez*. The Vulgar being authorized throughout all the Western Churches, he durst not entirely reject it, and therefore he printed it with his Commentary, but not believing it to be exact, he hath annexed thereto a new *Latin* Translation taken from the Greek. He briefly gives an account of his design in an Epistle at the beginning of his Work. *Exhibemus* (says he, speaking to *Guillaume Priconnet*) *divini eloquii Pauli Vulgatæ Editionis Epistolas prima fronte legendas, & è regione earumdem intelligentiam ex Græco respondentem.*

Jac. Fab.
Stapul.Ep.
Dedic. ad
Guill. Bri-
conn.

(c) *Sed fœnum, inquiunt, habet in cornu, & neminem non lacerat. Ita ne tandem lacerare vocant dissentire in litteris?* *Erasm. Epist. ad Cristoph. Fisch.*

It

It is in a manner to condemn the Version of the Church, to introduce a new one under pretence that the ancient was not sufficiently conformable to the *Greek Original*. Inasmuch that *Jacobus Faber* foreseeing (d) the Objections that might be made thereupon, denies that he hath attempted any thing against St. *Jerom's* Version; he distinguishes the *Vulgar* that was read in our Churches from the Translation of this Father, and by this distinction thinks to avoid all Accusations that might be brought against him on this account, since (as he imagines) St. *Jerom* himself hath impugned this ancient Version called the *Vulgar*.

But we have already proved that this Author is mistaken, when he pretends that the present *Latin Edition* is not St. *Jerom's*: he might have made a New Translation of the New Testament, without destroying the ancient which was in the hands of all the Christian World; but he thought himself to be a man sufficiently skilfull in the *Greek* tongue to publish one after his own model. However, if we examine his Translation and his Observations, we shall find therein the marks of a great weakness; he discovers in several places that he had but an indifferent knowledge of the *Greek* tongue. But since his Version hath a strict connexion with his Notes, I thought it would be more convenient to discourse thereof in particular in the third part of this Work, where I shall treat of the Commentators. I shall only add here, that *Jacobus Lopez Stunica*, a *Spanish* Divine, hath written vehemently against the Version of the Epistles of St. *Paul* composed by *Jacobus Faber*; he accused him for unadvisedly altering several places of the *Vulgar Edition* that perfectly agreed with the *Greek*; he declares moreover (e) that he found to great a number of faults in this Version, that it required a whole Volume to refute them: indeed he produces very convincing Proofs, as when he reproves him for making *Tertius* an appellative Noun in the 16th Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans* vers. 22. it being certain that it is a proper Name in this place: Moreover, in the First Epistle to the *Corinthians*, ch. 5. v. 4. where it is in the *Greek* συναχθέντων, and in the *Vulgar Congregatis*, being gathered together; *Jacobus Faber* hath translated *condolentibus*, condoling, which *Stunica* reprehends as a gross fault, that could not proceed but from his ignorance of the *Greek* tongue.

(d) Nonnulli fortè mirabuntur non parum, quòd ad translationem Hieronymi intelligentiam Græcam adicere ausi fuerimus, id nimis insolenter factum arbitantes, & me temerarij & audacia non tam accusabunt quàm damnabunt... Verùm nos bonà venià dignabuntur, cùm planè intelligent nos ad Sacri Hieronymi translationem nihil ausos, sed ad *Vulgatam Editionem* ante B. & gloriosum Ecclesiæ lumen Hieronymum. Jac. Fab. Stab. Epist. ad Guill. Briccon.

(e) Cùm præsertim multa loca in Editione *Vulgata* ex Græco optimè traducta, imò quæ aliud significare non possunt, nisi ut vetus Interpretes transtulit, *Stapulensis Faber* perperam Latinitati reddiderit... tot errata, cùm translationem illam Fabri discuteremus, sese nobis offerebant, ut si omnia ad plenum annotanda ac refellenda forent, non parvum volumen exposcentes. Jac. Lop. Stun. in Prol. Annot. adv. Jac. Fabr. Stapul.

But after all, this *Spanish Doctor* hath not always done him justice, he might have written against him with more moderation. It was then very rare to find any Divines that understood *Greek*; and if there are some faults in the modern Translation of *Jacobus Faber*, it contains also many usefull Illustrations; nevertheless, he ought not to have departed so far as he hath done from the ancient *Latin Version*; perhaps he would have been more judicious in exhibiting his new Interpretation merely in form of Critical Remarks: As for example, when he translated these *Greek words* in the first Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*, ver. 9. ϕ λατρεύω, by [these in *Latin*, *quem colo*, *whom I worship*, he should only have observed that λατρεύω signifies *colo*, and that it ought to be taken in this place for the Worship that is given to God, and that therefore the Vulgar which hath, *cui servio*, *whom I serve*, doth not seem to be exact. But *Stunica* hath learnedly represented to him, that it is not the part of one that understands the *Greek* and the style of the Holy Scriptures to restrain this Verb to the Worship of God, under pretence that it is said in Deut 6.13. *Deuteronomy*, *Soli Deo servies*, and that it is read λατρεύσεις in the *Greek*. If we may judge of the signification of this *Greek Verb* by the *Hebrew* where it is expressed תַּעֲבֹד, it is evident that the *Hebrew Verb עָבַד* is indifferently applied in the Bible both to God and Men. But we shall discourse more at large elsewhere concerning the Version of *Jacobus Faber* and his Commentaries. He seems to attribute some authority to the Epistle to the *Laodiceans*, which hath been published under the name of *St. Paul*; for he hath caused it to be printed with the other Epistles of this Apostle, and declares that he found it in four Libraries which he names. *Eistola*, says he, *quam misit Paulus ad Laodicenses inter Epistolas ejus nunc non continetur: verum unam titulo Pauli ad Laodicenses insignitam quatuor in locis reperi, primum Patavii in cœnobio S. Joannis de Viridario, Coloniae apud Fratres communis vitæ, & apud Parisios in Bibliothecis Eduana & Sorbonica, quam quia non nisi pietatem continere conspexi, nihil etiam fuerit à pietate alienum, si eam hoc in loco inseramus, ut qui fuerint studiosi Pauli legant, & etiam consolentur legentes.*

Jac. Fab.
Stapul. in
Epist. ad
Laod.

Erasmus is the first that hath composed in these latter times an entire *Latin Version* of the whole New Testament from the *Greek Original*; he published the first Edition thereof at *Basil*, in the year 1516. together with an Epistle dedicated to Pope *Leo X.* who was a Lover of Learning, in this Epistle he informs us in few words what was his design in making a new Translation of the Books of the (f) New Testament from the

(f) *Novum Testamentum universum ad Græcæ Originis fidem recognovimus, idque non temerè neque levi opera, sed adhibitis in consilium compluribus utriusque linguæ codicibus, nec iis sanè quibuscumque, sed vetustissimis simul & emendatissimis. Et quoniam novimus in rebus sacris religiosè quoque versandum esse, nec hac contenti diligentia per omnia veterum Theologorum scripta circumvolantes ex horum citationibus aut expositionibus subodorati sumus quid quisque legisset, aut mutasset. Adjecimus annotationes nostras, quæ primum*

Greek, and affirms that water is more pure in the spring than in the channels ; but foreseeing that it might be objected to him that the present Greek is not pure ; he adds, that he hath consulted diverse ancient Copies both Greek and Latin that were very correct ; he protests moreover, that lest he should publish any thing but what was exact in a matter of this importance, he hath had recourse to the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, to find out the readings of their time ; lastly, he declares, that he hath added Notes to his Version in which he explains the reasons that he had to alter some passages in the ancient Edition, and illustrate at the same time those places that are ambiguous or obscure.

One would think that a Version wherein the Author had taken such prudent precautions would have given content to the whole World ; however several Divines rose up against him, even before his Work was altogether published ; they could not endure that a private person should presume to exalt himself above St. Jerome, to whom the Vulgar Edition was unanimously attributed ; they esteemed his Version as a pernicious innovation in the Church, especially by reason of the Notes that he had annexed thereto : whereupon Erasmus was obliged to revise his Work in diverse places in a second Edition which he set forth not long after, under this Title : *Novum Testamentum omne multò quàm antebac diligentius ab Erasmo Roterodamo recognitum, emendatum ac translatum, non solum ad Græcam veritatem, verum etiam ad multorum utriusque linguæ codicum eorumque veterum simul & emendatorum fidem.* He prefixed at the beginning of this 2d Edition an Epistle of Pope Leo X. dated Sept. 10. 1518. whence it appears that this Pope did him justice, without having any regard to an infinite number of half learned persons that harassed this judicious Critic ; He commends his Work as being full of profound Learning, and generally approved by all Learned men. *Valde nos delectarunt* (says he) *lucubrationes tuæ in Testamentum Novum jam pridem editæ, non tam quia nostro nomini dicatæ fuerant, quam quod non vulgari, sed nova & insigni quadam eruditione præstabant, omniumque doctorum calculo plurimum laudabantur.* He congratulates his success in this second Edition, which came not into the hands of all the People till the year 1519. And forasmuch as (g) he found the first to be very exact, he judgeth that this second, being enriched with a greater number of Notes than the former, would be extremely usefull to the Church.

It is probable that this approbation of Pope Leo X. hindered the Inquisitors of Spain from placing Erasmus's Version among the prohibited

primum lectorem doceant quid, qua ratione fuerit immutatum. Deinde si quid aliqui perplexum, aut ambiguum, aut obscurum, id explicent atque enodent. Erasmus. Epist. ad Leon. X.

(g) *Ex prima illa editione quæ absolutissima videbatur conjecturam facientes qualis hæc futura, quantumve boni Sacræ Theologiæ studiosis ac orthodoxæ nostræ fidei sit allatura.* Leon. X. Epist. ad Erasmus.

Books, since they spared not his other Works. Therefore it was reprinted at *Antwerp*, anno 1616 in a Collection of several Translations of the Bible, and it is also (b) commended therein; moreover, it is affirmed in the Preface of this Collection, that the Sovereign Tribunal of the *Spanish Inquisition* hath made no objection against it, having permitted the reading thereof generally to all sorts of persons. But some Divines were not so moderate with respect to *Erasmus*; for they condemned his Version, even before it was made public, believing that it tended to introduce a dangerous novelty into the Church. *Martinus Dorpius*, a Doctor of *Lovain*, who was one of his Friends, used his utmost endeavours in the year 1515. to dissuade him from this Undertaking, representing to him that there was no defect in the Vulgar; he desired, at least, that he would alter in the ancient Edition only those places wherein the Greek words might be more emphatically expressed. *Erasmus* asserts on the contrary in his Answer to this Divine, (i) That it is as clear as the Light, that the ancient *Latin* Interpreter hath not well translated several words of his Original, and that the true reading of the Vulgar hath been often corrupted by the Copiers, and even by certain half-learned persons who have taken the liberty to correct it. As for what *Dorpius* had objected to him, that he ought not to abandon an Edition that was authorized by so many Councils; he replied that he imitated in this particular the common Divines who usually support every thing that through any means happen'd to be publicly used by the authority of the Church, *Quod scribis* (says he) *ab hac editione non esse recedendum tot videlicet Conciliis approbata, more vulgarium Theologorum facit, qui quicquid ullo modo in publicum usum irrepsit Ecclesiasticæ tribuere solent auctoritati.* (k) He passionately wisheth that the Popes had leisure to make wholesome Constitutions concerning the restoration of good Authors by faithfull and correct Copies; he requires at the same time that all those false Divines, who esteem nothing but what they have learn'd, and apply themselves only to unprofitable studies, should be removed from this employment.

Ibid.

If this able Critic had seen the Decree of the Council of *Trent*, and the fair Editions of *Robert Stephens*, *Hentenius* and the *Lovain* Divines, together with the learned Observations of *Lucas Brugensis*, perhaps he

(i) *Illud ipsa res clamat, & vel cæco, quod aiunt, potest esse perspicuum. sæpe vel ob imperitiam Interpretis, vel ob oscitantiam Græca male reddita esse, sæpe germanam ac veram lectionem ab indoctis librariis fuisse depravatam. Erasmi. Epist. ad Martin. Dorp. Epist. Lib. 31. Epist. 42.*

(k) *Utinam tantum esset otii Romanis Pontificibus, ut hisce de rebus salutare ederent constitutiones, quibus cavere:ur de restituendis bonorum auctorum monumentis, de parandis & reponendis bonis exemplaribus. Verum in eo consilio sedere nolim istos falsissimo nomine Theologos, qui huc tantum spectant, ut quod ipsi didicerunt, id solum habeatur in pretio. Quid autem ipsi didicerunt quod non sit neptissimum? Erasmi. ibid.*

would

would not have undertaken to compose a New Version of the Books of the New Testament from the *Greek*; at least he would have been so circumspect as not to depart so far as he hath done from the ancient *Latin* Edition. And he would have acknowledged that they who took pains by order of the Popes in the correction of the *Vulgar*, were not of the number of those common Divines whom he seems so much to contemn. *Erasmus's* reasons made so strong an impression on the mind of *Dorpius*, that he entirely submitted to them, and left nothing undone afterwards that might tend to promote the new Translation made by his Friend and the study of the *Greek* tongue, as it hath been above related. But there were other Divines that were not so easily persuaded as he, and among the rest, *Edward Ley*, an *English* man, who criticized with a great deal of passion on *Erasmus's* Version of the four Gospels, and who failed not incessantly to answer his Adversary. This *English* Divine shewed much Learning on this subject in a time when the most part of his Brethren were but very little addicted thereto; but since he was not expert in the *Greek* tongue, and not well exercised in the Art of Critic, *Erasmus* ingeniously confuted him, and in his Answer illustrated diverse matters that deserve to be read; he declares, among other things, that he doth not pretend to ascribe any authority to the alterations which he might make by his Version in the ancient *Latin* Interpretation, if they are not approved by the Church. *Ego quod muto in privata lectione non volo quidquam habere ponderis, nisi comprobet Ecclesiae auctoritas.*

*Erasm. ad-
vers. An-
not. Edw.
Ley.
Id. Resp.
ad quart.
Annot.
Ley.*

If he had had no other design in exhibiting a new Translation of the New Testament taken from the *Greek*, but only to instruct private persons, without reflecting on the old Edition, none could object against his proceedings: But he thought that it was not possible for him to establish his Version but on the ruins of the ancient; and this is that which chiefly procured him so many Adversaries. He had indeed a fair Plea, that he resigned himself up wholly in this matter to the judgment of the Church, *Testamur & ubique testatum esse volumus, nos nusquam à judicio Ecclesiae Catholicae ad unguem ac digitum velle discedere*: however, he was not believed; especially when he had printed a Catalogue of the Solecisms and Faults of the Translation, which he affirmed to be in the ancient *Latin* Edition. He had not always reason on his side in this practice, his Critical Determinations being often too much precipitated; and there are several places where he hath not done justice to the Interpreter of the Church. He was attached with greater force by *Jacobus Lopes Stunica*, a *Spaniard*, who was more skilfull in the Critical Science than the *English* Divine. *Stunica* reproves *Erasmus* for having no other intent when he undertook his Translation, but to take an occasion freely to censure the ancient Version of the Church: *Eo in primis animo, ut veterem Ecclesiae translationem ejusdemque auctorem captata occasione libere posset reprehendere.* He judiciously represents to him, that if the *Vulgar* Edition was not always conformable to the ordinary *Greek* Copies, and

*Erasm.
Dissert.
cont. me-
ros. quosd.
& indoct.*

*Jac. Lop.
Stun. Probl.
Annot.
adv. Eras.
in Defens.
Tral. N.T.
if*

Stun. ib.

if several faults have crept into it, as it usually happens to all Books ; it was then requisite to make separate remarks thereupon, there being no necessity to compose a new Translation of the whole Scripture, and that an ancient Version, that was used in the Church for so many Ages, ought not to be altered and subverted on this account. *Seorsim* (says he) *ille erant annotanda, non totum Scripturæ corpus denuo transferendum, non immutanda vetera, non quæ tandem usitata fuerant tam licenter invertenda.*

Erasin. A-
pol. ad ea
quæ in N.
T. taxav.
Jac. Lop.
Stun.

If *Erasmus* had chosen this method, I believe he that would have performed a more signal piece of service to the Church, than in furnishing it with a new Translation of the whole New Testament, in which he often varies from the old without any apparent cause ; he wrote an Answer to *Stunica* under the Title of an Apology, wherein he objects to him, that he hath taken many things from the Learned *Nebrissenfis*. *Si detrahas* (says he) *illi quod hausit ex Lexicis, quod ex Annotationibus eruditissimi viri Antonii Nebrissenfis, cujus gloriæ meritum atque ex animo favemus, haud multum supererit quod jactet Stunica.* But whether *Stunica* took his Observations out of his own store, or from that of others, they are no less true. It is certain that he hath very well corrected *Erasmus* in several places, but because these Corrections more frequently relate to his Notes than to his Version, we shall discourse of them more at large in the third Part of this Critical History, where we shall also examine some other Writings that were opposed against him, and to which he replied. We have all his Apologies, wherein he treats of a great number of Questions concerning the Critical Art on occasion of the Objections that were made to him, almost all of them are resolved into the authority of the Church, which *Erasmus* seemed to despise in substituting a modern Translation of the New Testament in the room of the ancient. He replied to the Divines who always inculcated to him this authority (1) that though the general contempt of Critical Reflections on the Sacred Books had caused much confusion therein, nevertheless they had nothing else to oppose to him but the Authority of the Church and the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.

I am apt to believe that they that condemned the Version of *Erasmus* and his Annotations had not an exact knowledge of the matter concerning which they disputed, and that this obliged them to have recourse to Common-places or to General-questions in Divinity ; but he himself had given occasion to this method, because he sometimes argues as a Divine in his Notes : this was also the foundation of the Censures of the Doctors of *Paris*, which I shall not here examine, as neither the Book of *Petrus Sutor* that hath been elsewhere mentioned ; and which was

(1) *Nunc cum contemptis linguis, totaque lectionis curâ neglectâ, nè codicum quidem habitâ ratione, tam multa confusa corruptaque sint in sacris codicibus, isti nihil aliud occinunt nobis quam Auctoritatem Ecclesiæ & Spiritum Sanctum Scripturarum Auctorem.*
Erasin. Apol. adv. quosd. Monach. Hispan.

chiefly written against *Erasmus's* late Translation. *Sutor* pretended that it was not more lawfull to make new Translations of the Bible than to change *Cicero's* style into another: *Nonne* (says he) *injuriā faceret Tullio, qui ejus stylum immutare vellet?* But without offence to this Divine of *Paris*, there is a great deal of difference between reforming the style of a Book and composing a Version of the same Book; a Translation of the New Testament might be made from the *Greek* or from the *Latin*, without altering the *Greek* or the *Latin* Original; nevertheless, *Erasmus* had given cause for these sorts of Complaints, because he seemed to design that his Version should be established in the place of the ancient, which he hath too easily accused, as it appears from one of his Answers, entituled, *Adversus quosdam morosos & indoctos*, where he declares with too great liberty, that the ancient *Latin* Interpreter often falls into gross Errors, which are proofs (as he says) of his ignorance in the *Greek* tongue: *Illam palam vel dormitasse, vel lapsum esse, vel insciē reddidisse Græca.*

Pet. Sut.
de Tral.
Bibl. c. 28.

Erasm.
cont. moros.
quosd.
& indoct.

However, the Catalogue of the Mistakes of this Interpreter is not so large as this Critic imagines; if he had only forsaken him in those places where the old Edition is defective, he would not have entirely cast it into a new model, as he hath done, he frequently gives the name of a fault to that which is translated with too much exactness, and it is on this account that he reprehends the Solecisms, Barbarisms, and some other Imperfections of the style, *Tot mendas* (says he) *sustulimus, tot loca malè reddita explicuimus, tot solæcismos amovimus, tot insignes lapsus indicavimus, tot amphibolias rescuimus.* But there is much more reason to accuse *Erasmus* in this particular of too much curiosity, for most judicious Persons will prefer the Barbarism of the ancient *Latin* Edition before *Erasmus's* politeness, because it is not a defect in an Interpreter of the Holy Scriptures exactly to follow his Original, and even to represent its *Hyperbata*. If the Interpreter of the Church doth not use very pure *Latin* expressions, it is because he applies himself faithfully to render the words of the *Greek* Text: it is an easie matter to remedy these pretended defects by little Notes, without any necessity of absolutely altering a Version.

Erasm. ib.

This is the *Idea* that a Learned Protestant of *England* hath conceived of the ancient *Latin* Interpretation, in a Work that he composed on purpose against the modern Translators. (m) If the ancient Interpreter (says this learned Critic) were never abandoned but when the necessity of the sense requires it, there would not be so great a difference betwixt him and the other,

(m) *Si nusquam discederetur à vetere Interprete, nisi ubi necesse est, nusquam autem necesse est, nisi ubi sensu incolumi verba ejus retineri non possunt, non tanta esset inter illum & alios dissonantia, sed revocarentur multa quæ posteriores Interpretes rejecerunt. Non malè itaque collocaret quis operam, si veterem Interpretem daret in duntaxat locis interpolatum ubi à Græcis sic recedit, ut necessariò sit deferendus. Joann. Boys, Collat. vet. Interp. cum rec. ad c. 4. Matth.*

Ibid.

and many things would be re-established that have been rejected by later Interpreters. Therefore any one might employ his time to good purpose in publishing the ancient Latin Edition of the New Testament corrected only in those places in which it plainly appears not to be conformable to the Greek. He adds, That he had undertaken this Work, *Hoc ego jam conor atque meditor*. But I do not believe that he hath published it. This was a great and noble design, being worthy of the pains of an able Critic. If *Erasmus* had only proposed his Version as a Work that might be usefull to private persons, without laying aside their ancient Interpretation, perhaps he would not have found so many Adversaries; but under colour of his new Translation, he loses no opportunity to attach the old. I do not desire (saith he) that they should believe me, let them rather believe the ancient and correct Copies; *Non postulo ut mihi credant, credant vetustis & emendatis exemplaribus, credant Græcæ veritati*. As if our Latin Edition were not taken from the Greek Original. Hath he seen all the good MSS. Copies of the New Testament that are extant? He hath indeed cited some of them, and deserves great commendation for the search that he hath made for them in a time when Critical Observations were not regarded by the Divines.

Eras. ib.

Theod.
Bez. Epist.
ad Elizab.
Reg. Angl.

Eras. ib.

If we reflect on all that hath been said concerning the ancient Greek Copies of the New Testament in the first part of this History, we shall soon perceive that he hath not read a sufficient number of these MSS. to judge of them exactly, and that he hath condemned the ancient Greek readings authorized by our Vulgar, because he confided too much in his Manuscripts. This is the same thing for which *Theodorus Beza*, who otherwise was not favourable to the ancient Interpreter of the Church, hath sharply reprov'd him. Doth not *St. Jerome*, who revised the old Latin Edition avouch, that he hath consulted the best and the most ancient Greek Copies of his time? This Father was sufficiently skilfull in the Greek tongue and in the Art of Critic to make a good choice; however, *Erasmus* presumes to correct him, and objects to diminish the authority of our Version, that Pope *Damasus* did not order him in the quality of a Pope, but as a Friend to reform the old Edition, and that nevertheless he did not approve it. *Hieronymo mandavit Damasus. Mandavit, sed ut amicus, non ut summus Pontifex. Mandasse legimus, approbasse non legimus*. A strange way of arguing! Can it be supposed that if *Damasus* had given these Orders to *St. Jerom* in quality of a Pope, this Father would have been an abler man, and more infallible in his correction? *Damasus* chose *St. Jerom* to accomplish his design, because he knew none more capable of this employment than he, and indeed he was not deceived.

Ibid.

I shall not spend time in refuting what *Erasmus* adds in the same place, where he affirms, that without doubt *St. Jerom's* Correction is no longer extant. *Extra controversiam est non exstare castigationem Hieronymi*: since I have already proved the contrary. This Critick would have done

done much better if he had published his Version as a Work which ought to serve to illustrate that which was used for so many Ages in the Western Churches; sometimes he seems to have observed this method, for he declares in an Apology that is commonly found before his Translation (n) that he does not intend to destroy the ancient Edition; whether St. Jerom be the Author thereof, or whether it were made by another; but that his design was only to re-establish that which was corrupted through the length of time and the negligence of the Copiers, having likewise marked by the way those passages that are not very accurately translated by the ancient Interpreter: If he had stopped here, he would not have made a new Translation; he would have contented himself in revising the old and inserting certain Critical Remarks in the margin; then he might have truly said what he adds in this same Apology. (o) *Let those that admire the old Edition preserve it entire, since I have not condemned it, nor altered any thing therein, but have only render'd it more clear, more pure, and more correct; let it be read in the Schools, let it be sang in the Churches, let it be cited in the Sermons, and let none binder it; but I durst avouch that they who reade my Version at home shall better understand their ancient one.* I confess that on this account Erasmus's Translation and even all the other late Versions of the New Testament from the Greek may have their proper use; but if the modern Translators had no other design but this, it would not be necessary for them to depart so far from the ancient Latin Interpreter, as it will appear in the sequel of this Discourse.

(n) *Nos nec hanc qualiscunque est, aut cujuscunque est, neque convellimus ullo modo, neque calumniamur. Tantum restituimus quæ temporum aut librariorum vitio fuerant depravata, obiter indicatis & his quæ vel ambigunt, vel parum attentè reddidit interpres.* Erasmus in Apolog.

(o) *Quibus placet hæc editio, quam ego nec damno nec muto, his sua manet editio. Siquidem ea nostra castigatione non læditur, sed redditur illustrior, purior, emendatior. Illa legatur in scholis, canatur in templis, citetur in concionibus, nullus obstat. Illud autem polliceri, quisquis hanc nostram domi legerit, suam rectius intelleturus.* Erasmus ibid.

C H A P. XXII.

Of Erasmus's Version in particular, and of the Correction thereof by Flacius Illyricus.

ALthough *Erasmus* professes to follow the *Greek* Original, yet he doth not pretend that his Version is more exact than our *Latin* Edition in all those places where it is not conformable to the *Greek*; But because he translated from the *Greek*, it was requisite to preserve uniformity, that he should adhere to it altogether. This is what he himself hath observed in the Apology prefixed to his Translation. (a) There are (says he) some passages in which our Vulgar or the Edition of Saint *Ambrose* (of *Hilary* the Deacon) is preferable to the *Greek* Copies, but since these Copies agree all therein I have suited my Version to them, to the end that it might perfectly correspond with the *Greek*. He produceth, for example, a manifest Gloss which he found in all the *Greek* Copies in the 6th Chapter of *St. Matthew*, vers. 13. at the End of the *Lord's Prayer*, and which nevertheless was not found (as he says) in any *Latin* Copy: *Comperio quædam apud illos addita ex more solenni, veluti coronidem illam sic additam Precationi Dominicæ, quemadmodum apud nos in calce Psalmorum adjicitur, Gloria Patri. Ea non resecurimus à contextu; sed tamen in commentariolis admonuimus addita.*

Erasm. ib.

Therefore *Erasmus's* Version must not be separated from his Annotations, because he doth not always approve what he hath inserted in the Text of his Translation; indeed (b) he could give but one reading, though there often happen to be divers in the *Greek*, which he hath remarked in his Notes, where he shews those that he judgeth to be the best; at least after having exhibited all, he leaves it to the liberty of the Readers to chuse which they shall think fit. But notwithstanding all this, he might have composed a *Latin* Translation of the New Testament less different from the ancient Edition, and yet consonant to the *Greek* Text, as it may be easily proved. As for example, it was not necessary in the first Chapter of *St. Matthew's* Gospel, vers. 19. to put *infamare* instead of *traducere* which is in the Vulgar; it were sufficient to explain by a

(a) *Sunt in quibus nostra vera magis probatur editio, aut Ambrosiana lectio, quam Græci codices; Et tamen consentientibus omnibus Græcis exemplaribus, quoniam illa mutare non licuit, Latina accomodavimus, ne non responderent, cum in hoc ipsum adderentur. Erasm. in Apolog.*

(b) *Unicam duntaxat lectionem proponimus; nec enim aliter poteramus. Ceterum in annotamentis varias referimus, aut indicantes quid nobis optimum videatur, aut lectoris relinquentes arbitrio quid sequi malit. Erasm. ibid.*

little Note the signification of the word *traducere* in this place, which very well expresses the Greek Verb *μεταφρασις*. I should have chosen rather to translate simply in the second Chapter of this Gospel, verse 1. *in Bethlehem Judææ*, in *Bethlehem of Judea*, conformably to the Greek Text and the Vulgar, than *in Bethlehem civitate Judææ*, in *Bethlehem a city of Judea*: for (as Dr. John Boys hath judiciously observed on this place and several others) these sorts of Additions that explain the Text ought to be reserved to the Notes. *Quod si explicationis ergo addenda sunt aliqua, in annotationibus quàm in contextu rectius collocentur.*

Joan. Boys
Collat. ver.
Interp.
cum rec.
c. 2. Matth.
v. 1.

What necessity was there of changing *qui natus est*, as it is in the Vulgar in the second verse of the same Chapter, into *ille qui natus est*? It would be too tedious to insist on these minute circumstances, which indeed make no alteration as to the sense; but it is much more convenient to preserve the ancient *Latin* Edition entire in all the places where it exactly answers to the *Greek* Text. These Alterations which are frequent in *Erasmus's* Version are for the most part of no importance; therefore it would be more judicious to alter in the ancient Interpretation of the Church onely what is absolutely necessary to be corrected to render it more exact; and perhaps also it would be more expedient to insert the Corrections in the margent in form of Remarks. According to this method these words, *responsio accepto*, in the 12th verse of this Chapter, as they are in the Vulgar, ought not to be changed into this expression, *oraculo admoniti*, as *Erasmus* hath done. However, we must be so just to him as to acknowledge that he hath taken much less liberty than the other Translators of the New Testament that have followed him. This variation often proceeds from the judgment that he passed on the ancient Version, viz. that it was not written in proper *Latin*; as for example, in this same Chapter of *St. Matthew*, verse 18. instead of *noluit consolari*, he hath put, *noluit consolationem admittere*; nevertheless, the Verb *consolari* is found in the Passive voice among the ancient Authors; besides, this great exactness, as to the propriety of *Latin* words in a Translation of the Holy Scriptures, is not always seasonable; for care ought to be chiefly taken how to express well the sense of the Original. This caused Dr. John Boys prudently to remark, that if the modern Translators had abandoned the ancient Interpretation only in those places where it is necessary, their Versions would not have been so different from it. *Si nusquam discederetur à vetere Interprete, nisi ubi necesse est, (nusquam autem necesse est, nisi ubi sensu incolumi verba ejus retineri non possunt) non tanta esset inter illum & alios dissonantia.*

Joan. Boys
ib. ad c. 4.
Matth.

There are certain words in our *Latin* Edition that may be called *consecrated*, because they have been received for many Ages in the Western Churches. *Erasmus* is more exact in retaining them than the most part of other Translators. We read, for example, in the third Chapter of *St. Matthew*, *pœnitere*, and *pœnitentia* in the Vulgar: I know not on what account he hath translated in the second verse of this Chapter

pœnitentiam

pœnitentiam agite vitæ prioris, repent ye of your former life, as if pœnitentiam agite, repent ye, had not been sufficient, since he made a Version, and not a Paraphrase. I could wish also that that he had preserved a greater Uniformity than he hath done with respect to these consecrated words and some others; for what reason could he have to express the same Greek Verb μετανοεῖτε in Chap. 4. ver. 17. of the same Gospel by resipiscite instead of pœnitentiam agite, as it is in the Vulgar? The learned Protestant lately cited hath very well observed on this place (c) that the ancient form of speaking which hath been received for a long time in the Church, ought not to be altered; this he proves also by this little Note of Melancthon; Nos loquamur cum Ecclesia. Ne pudeat nos materni sermonis. Ecclesia est mater nostra. Sic autem loquitur Ecclesia.

Phil. Melanct. apud Boys.

The Judgment of these two moderate Protestants condemns the modern Translators in general, who have taken the liberty to alter the expressions of our Latin Translation which the use of the Church had in a manner consecrated; nay, it sometimes happens that the sense is weakened by these sorts of alterations. It was not requisite for example, that Erasmus, in the 6th Chapter of St. Matthew, verse 16. should translate the Greek word ἀφανίζω by *obscurant*, whereas the Vulgar hath *exterminant*. Dr. John Boys who hath vindicated the Latin Interpreter in this place by the authority of St. Chrysostom, who explains the Verb ἀφανίζω, by διαφθείρω, *corrumpunt*, insists that this sense ought to be attributed to the Latin Verb *exterminant*, and censures these modern Translators that have render'd it otherwise, under pretence that this word is not purely Latin. If this expression (says he) hath nothing of elegance in it, at least it is extremely proper, *Parum fortasse eleganter verbum ἀφανίζω sic reddidit, sed appositè ut qui maximè.* In the 10th Chapter of the same Gospel, verse 22. instead of these words that are in the Vulgar, *qui perseveraverit, Erasmus hath put, qui sustinuerit.* It is true that this last Interpretation doth well express the Greek Verb ὑπομένειν. But the same Dr. Boys could not endure that the ancient Version should be altered in this passage. *Hoc probo* (says he, speaking of those that had translated *sustinuerit*) *illud præfero, si non ob aliud ac vetustatis causa, à qua absque justiore aliqua ratione discedendum non esse puto.* This judicious Protestant blames those without any necessity have changed words that were authorized by a long custome.

Joan. Boys ad cap. 6. Matt. v. 16.

Id. ad c. 10. Matt. v. 22.

In the 11th Chapter of the same Gospel, verse 5. where it is read in the Greek ἐὺαγγελίζονται, & in the Vulgar *evangelizantur*, Erasmus hath translated *lætum accipiunt Evangelii nuncium.* He expresseth that by se-

(c) Receptissimam in Ecclesia loquendi formulam, pœnitentiam agite, nolim penitus excludi. Sed si minus in contextu, at in margine saltem locari. Sed me autore ne è contextu quidem excludetur. Joann. Boys, ibid. ad cap. 4. Matt. v. 17.

veral words which he might have render'd by one which indeed is not *Latin*, but (as the Learned Dr. Boys hath observed) (d) it is ancient, and may aswell be used as many other words that have been allowed by the custome of the Church ; he subjoins in the same place, that he is not offended with the expression that is in our Vulgar, *qui non fuerit scandalizatus*, who shall not be scandalized ; because he is very willing to hear the Scripture speaking as it were in its own peculiar dialect. *Erasmus* hath translated, *quisquis non fuerit offensus*, whosoever shall not be offended ; which is better *Latin*. This Reflexion may serve as a Rule for an infinite number of passages in the New Testament, where the modern Translators have affected to depart from the ancient *Latin* Edition.

Although *Erasmus* was expert in all things relating to the Grammatical Art, nevertheless he seems not to be exact when he adds certain Pronouns in the *Latin* that are not in the *Greek*, where there are only Articles which cannot be expressed in the *Latin* Tongue. Thus in the 13th verse of this Chapter of *St. Matthew* he hath translated *Propheta & ipsa Lex*, whereas there is nothing in the *Greek* that answers to the Pronoun *ipsa*. He falls into the same error in the first Chapter of *Saint John's Gospel*, verse 1. where he hath render'd these *Greek* words, Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, thus, *Deus erat ille Sermo*, which are much better translated in the Vulgar after this manner, *Deus erat Verbum*. This same fault is visible in the 8th and 9th verses, where it is read in his Version, *Non erat ille Lux illa. Erat Lux illa.* And in several other passages, which it would be needless to produce. *Erasmus* was deceived for want of a due consideration that the *Latins* have not any Articles distinguished from the Pronouns in their Language, as there are in the *Greek* and in the *French* ; therefore when we design to express in a *Latin* Version the emphasis that seems to be couched under the *Greek* Article, we should explain it by a little Note in the margent ; for there are some places where the Pronoun being put in the room of the Article, wholly alters the sense ; neither was it necessary for him to change in this same Chapter [of *St. John* the word *Verbum* into that of *Sermo*. *St. Jerome*, who corrected the ancient *Latin* Version, hath retained *Verbum* therein ; and the Learned Dr. Boys hath observed (e) that *Erasmus* was

(d) Quod repudiandum non videtur, quia & antiquum est, & Græcis planè respondet, nec ita malè Latinum est, quin possit unà cum multis aliis locutionibus quas Ecclesia sibi vendicat locum suum tueri. Sic proximo versu, qui non fuerit scandalizatus, me certe non offendit, quia libenter audio Scripturam suo quidem modo, suoque velut idiomate loquentem. Joann. Boys ad cap. 11. Matt. v. 5.

(e) Primus quod sciam *Erasmus* veterem Interpretem hoc nomine quòd Λόγος, Verbum verterit, reprehendit. Quod si Patrum & antiquorum Scriptorum testimonio standum sit, credo illos omnes multò sapientiùs & libentius verbi quàm sermonis vocabulo uti. Joann. Boys ad cap. 1. Joann.

the first that reprehended the Interpreter of the Church in this particular; and he adds, that if it may be determined by the Testimony of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, they have more frequently made use of the word *verbum* than of that of *sermo*.

In the 12th verse of this first Chapter of *St John*, where we read in the Vulgar conformably to the Original, *dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri*. *Erasmus* hath translated, *dedit eis ut liceret filios Dei fieri*; nevertheless there was no necessity to alter the ancient Version in this place, wherein the Greek word is literally expressed. It is true, that some Protestants believed that the word *potestas*, power, seems to favour the opinion of the *Pelagians* with respect to Free-will; But *Dr. Boys* hath judiciously remarked (f) that our Faith doth not depend on simple words, but on the true sense of those words, and that if it were once permitted to make New Translations of the Scripture, under pretence that the old have been abused, there would be no end of altering them; if the Greek word *ἐξουία* be admitted (continues this learned Protestant) why may not the Latin word *potestas* be likewise allowed, since there is no other that answers more exactly thereto? But this observation hath more regard to the *Calvenists* than to *Erasmus*; for these words, *ut liceret*, signify the same thing as *potestas*, and therefore he had no reason in this place to vary from the ancient Translation of the Church.

It would have been more expedient to retain with the ancient Interpreter the Latin word *Christus* in the 41st verse of the same Chapter, than to put *Unctus* in its place, as *Erasmus* hath done; because the custom of the Church hath as it were canonized the word *Christus*. There is also somewhat more natural and simple in that expression of the Vulgar in the 42d verse, *quod interpretatur Petrus*, than in this, *quod sonat, si interpreteris, lapis*; for the Verb *interpretari* is found aswell in the Active as in the Passive voice in the ancient Latin Authors, and in keeping the word *Petrus* in the Text, a Note should be inserted in the margent, to intimate that *Petrus* is the same thing as *πέτρος* in the Greek, that is to say, a stone. In the 8th Chapter of this Gospel where it is read in the Vulgar, *principium qui & loquor vobis*, *Erasmus* hath put in his Version, *in primis quod & loquor vobis*; but the Latin word *principium*, which in this place is expressed in the Accusative case, corresponds perfectly with the Greek *τὸ ἀρχὴν*, and makes a better sense than *in primis*, it being the same thing as *initio* or *prius*.

Dr. Boys hath learnedly observed that this manner of speaking is taken from the *Septuagint*, and subjoins at the same time that they who would rightly judge of the style of the Evangelists and Apostles ought to

(f) Non enim vocibus, sed vocum recta sanoque intellectu fides nostra nititur. Alioqui, si propter quosdam non recte sentientes, aut quæ bene dicta sunt male pervertentes, ad novas versiones confugeremus, quomodus esset? quæ finis? Joann. Boys ad c. i. Joann. v. 11.

be exercised in reading the Greek Version of these ancient Interpreters. *Mea sententia* (says he) *qui volet rectè judicare de Evangelistarum & Apostolorum sermone, ab illo nullo modo committendum est, ut sit hospes in Græcis & ἑβραϊστικῶν Bibliis.* Indeed it is a defect which is frequent among the most part of those that have written on the New Testament, and especially among the Protestants, who have too much neglected this ancient Greek Translation. *Erasmus*, who did not perfectly understand the Hebrew Tongue, was not capable of reading it with judgment, which hath caused him to fall into some errors. In the 14th Chapter of *St. John*, verse 16. where we find in the Vulgar, *alium Paracletum dabit vobis*; *Erasmus's* Version hath, *alium Consolatorem, another Comforter.* But besides that the word *Paracletus* is in a manner canoniz'd, it signifies rather an *Advocate*, or an *Intercessor*, that pleads the cause of Criminals, than a *Comforter*. Παράκλησις (saith *Grotius* in his Note on this place) *vox Græca frequens apud Judæos in Versione Chaldaea & apud Talmudicos, non pro Consolatore, sed pro eo qui causam agit alterius, & quidem rei.* In the first Chapter of *The Acts of the Apostles*, verse 4. where we read in *Erasmus's* Version, *congregans illos in idem loci*, *Dr. Boys* hath learnedly vindicated the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, who hath translated simply *convescens*; he opposeth to *Erasmus* and the other modern Translators of the New Testament (g) the Authority of *St. Chrysostome* and the rest of the *Greek* Commentators, who agree thereupon with our Interpreter: moreover, he objects to them the conformity of the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Translations with the Vulgar, and concludes from thence, that the ancient Version ought to be followed in this place, without having any regard to their Arguments to the contrary.

Grot. Annot. in e. 14. Joan. v. 16.

It is a fault common to the most part of the Interpreters of the Holy Scriptures, to specify in their Versions that which is declared in general in the Text: As for example, in the 13th Chapter of *The Acts*, verse 2. where we read in the Greek *κατεργάζοντο ὃ αὐτοῖς*, and in the Vulgar, *ministrantibus autem illis, but as they ministred*; *Erasmus* hath translated, *cum autem illi sacrificarent, but when they sacrificed.* Thus he hath limited to Sacrifice, or the publick action called by the *Grecians*, *Liturgy*, and the *Latins*, *Mass*, that which ought to be generally understood in this place concerning the Functions of the primitive Ministers of the Church: wherefore he had no reason to reform the Version of the ancient Interpreter; who hath very well expressed the *Greek* Verb *κατεργάζειν* according to the letter and genuine sense of Text. Whereas the style of *St. Paul's* Epistles is more intricate than that of the Gospels and of *The*

(g) *Chrysostomus & Græci Interpretes qui aequè intellexisse videntur vim hujus vocis, ac illi qui nostrâ aut Patrum nostrorum memoriâ vixerunt, uno ore eam tribuunt huic participio significationem quæ convescendi vocabulo, si non ita purè & eleganter, at verè satè & perspicuè exprimitur. Joann. Boys in c. 1. Act. Apost. v. 4.*

Acts of the Apostles ; it is also more difficult to translate them according to the true sense of this Apostle ; on this account I am apt to believe that the Vulgar ought to be preferred before the Translations of later Interpreters that depart too far from the letter ; for under colour of exhibiting a clearer sense, they make *St. Paul* to speak such things as he never imagined, or at least they weaken his expressions. *Erasmus* sometimes falls into this error, though he may be justly esteemed beyond the other modern Translators ; it would have been a more safe way to follow the ancient *Latin* Version which is generally literal, and to add little Notes in the margent to serve as Illustrations. To be convinced of this, you need only to cast an eye on the beginning of the Epistle to the *Romans*, and to compare *Erasmus's* Translation with the Vulgar in those places.

In the first Chapter of this Epistle, verse 1. where we read in the *Latin* Edition, *vocatus Apostolus*, called to be an Apostle, as it is in the Greek ; *Erasmus* hath translated, *vocatus ad munus Apostolicum*, called to the Apostolical office, which is not so natural, as being rather an Explication than a verbal Translation. In the 4th verse of this Chapter, where it is in the Greek, ὃς ἐκείνῳ ἐν Θεῷ ἐν δυνάμει, the ancient *Latin* Interpreter hath very well render'd it according to the letter, *qui prædestinatus est filius Dei in virtute* ; and this is the Version that was used in the Western Churches before *St. Jerome*, who hath altered nothing in this place : I shall not examine whether this Interpreter was *ωγοειδένῳ*, as some believe ; for *prædestinatus* here signifies no more than *destinatus*, appointed ; and therefore he might translate *prædestinatus* in reading *ἐκείνῳ*, as it is found at present in all the Greek Copies, and it does by no means relate to that which Divines commonly call Predestination. *Erasmus* nevertheless hath departed from this ancient Version, having inserted in his, *qui declaratus fuit filius Dei cum potentia* ; who was declared to be the Son of God with power. It is true indeed, that divers Learned Greek Fathers have explained the Verb *ἐκείνῳ* by *δειχθένῳ*, ἀπεφανένῳ, that is to say, *demonstrated*, or *declared* ; but an Explication is not a Translation : it might be remarked in a Note that this is the sense that *St. Chrysostome* hath given to this passage, without altering the ancient Version, which very well expresseth the force of the Greek word, that signifies rather *destinatus*, or *definitus*, than *declaratus*.

Moreover, although the Greek Particle *ἐν* signifies in the style of the Pen-men of the New Testament, which agrees with that of the Septuagint, *in* and *cum*, *in* and *with* ; nevertheless, it would be more convenient to translate, as it is in the Vulgar, *in virtute*, or *in potentia*, *in power* ; and to intimate in the margent that *in* signifies also *cum* ; because there is but one single Preposition that answers to these two in the Hebrew or Chaldaic Tongue, to which the Greek of the New Testament is often conformable, particularly in those sorts of Prepositions.

In the 9th verse of the same Chapter the ancient Interpreter hath very exactly render'd these Greek words $\epsilon\sigma\lambda\alpha\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ by these, *cui servo, whom I serve*: whereas Erasmus translating *quem colo, whom I worship*, hath not followed the true sense. Saint Paul in this place doth not make mention of Worship, but of his Ministry, intending thereby to shew, that he served God in Preaching the Gospel of his Son, as it evidently appears from the sequel of the Discourse.

If we should after this manner trace Erasmus's Version step by step, it were easie to demonstrate that he had no reason to depart from the ancient Latin Interpreter in many other places; however, we ought to be so just to him as to own that he is the most exact of all the modern Translators of the New Testament. I know that Beza often reproves him for inclining to Pelagianism; but this Impeachment generally hath no foundation; not to be a Calvinist, according to the style of the Ministers of Geneva, is to be a Pelagian. Erasmus had read the ancient Greek Fathers, whom he might justly prefer before other Ecclesiastical Writers, as to what relates to the right understanding of the Books of the New Testament which are written in Greek; it were only to be wished, that he had not limited the sense of the Original in some Passages, with respect to their Explications, which ought to have been inserted altogether in his Notes. One of the Places where Erasmus seems to favour Pelagianism is in the 12th verse of the 5th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, where, instead of translating as it is in the Vulgar, *in quo omnes peccaverunt, in whom all have sinned*, he hath render'd it, *quatenus omnes peccaverunt, inasmuch as all have sinned*: We find in the Greek $\epsilon\phi' \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$, which signifies (according to his opinion) *quatenus, inasmuch as, or, so that*; and not, *in quo, in whom*; for otherwise it should be expressed $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$. Pelagius indeed maintains this Interpretation in his Commentary on this Place, where he affirms that *in quo* is the same thing as *in eo quod*. But Origen had attributed this sense to these words long before Pelagius; and it hath been since confirmed by other Ecclesiastical Writers; so that Erasmus who applied himself to exhibit the Grammatical sense, might translate *quatenus*; nevertheless it had been better not to abandon the ancient Interpreter of the Church in a place of this importance; and he ought to have reserved to his Remark what he hath annexed to his Version.

Pelag.
Comm. in
cap. 5. E-
pist. ad
Rom. in-
ter Opera
B. Hieron.

Matthias Flacius Illyricus designing to furnish the Protestant party with certain Annotations on the Books of the New Testament according to his method, made choice of Erasmus's Version which he reformed in many places that he judged not to be sufficiently exact. (b) *I have en-*

(h) *Versionem Erasmi adjunctam in plurimis locis ad Græcam veritatem genuinamque cujusque loci sensum, & etiam sententiæ perspicuitatem, Græcarumque vocum, aut etiam Hebræarum proprietatem & emphasim emendare conati sumus.* Flac. Illyr. Epist. ad Argentor. ann. 1570.

deavoured (says he in his Epistle to the Citizens of Strasburg , to whom he dedicates his Work) to correct Erasmus's Version in several places , by the Greek Original , re-establishing the genuine sense of the Greek words , and even of the Hebrew . But if we may judge of his reformation by what he hath added in the first Chapter of Saint Matthew , it might be affirmed that he hath rather corrupted the Greek Text and Erasmus's Translation than corrected them . He reads in the 11th verse of this Chapter in the Greek , Ἰωσίας ὁ ἐξ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰακώβου , Ἰακώβου ὁ ἐξ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰεζεκιῶν . and in the Latin , *Josias autem genuit Jakim , Jakim autem genuit Jechoniam ; and Josias begat Jakim , and Jakim begat Jechonias* . He adds these words , *Jakim , and Jakim begat* ; and doth not confirm this addition in his Notes by any Manuscript : But in case he had any , he ought not to prefer them before the ordinary Reading , and the greater number of Copies ; he would have acted more judiciously , if he had given an account thereof in the margent of the Greek Edition ; nevertheless , this is what he calls re-establishing Erasmus's Latin Version by the true Greek Original .

He hath restored the word *verbum* in the beginning of the first Chapter of Saint John , which Erasmus hath changed into that of *sermo* ; so that he apparently believed that *verbum* expressed better the Greek word λόγος in this place , than *sermo* ; but he hath retained the superfluous Pronouns above-mentioned ; for he hath inserted *verbum illud , lux illa* , and an infinite number of other Pronouns which are not found in the Greek Text .

In the 12th verse of the same Chapter he hath not render'd the Greek word ἐξουσίαν by *ut liceret* with Erasmus , nor by *potestatem* according to the Vulgar ; but thus , *banc dignitatem* , in imitation of Beza . In the 41st verse of the same Chapter he hath re-established the word *Christus* , which Erasmus had changed into *Unctus* . In the 8th Chapter of the same Gospel , verse 25 . he hath not translated with Erasmus , *in primis* , where we read in the Greek ἀρχῇ , but *à principio* .

Moreover he hath reformed Erasmus's Version in the 13th Chapter of The Acts of the Apostles , where he hath translated these Greek words , λειτουργήσαντες αὐτοῖς , after this manner , *cum autem illi ministrarent* , but *when they ministred* , wherein he follows the ancient Latin Interpreter , whose Translation he likewise prefers before that of Erasmus in the 5th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans , verse 12 . where he reads , *in quo omnes peccaverunt* , in whom all have sinned ; and not , *quatenus omnes peccaverunt* , inasmuch as all have sinned .

The exactness of *Flacius Illyricus's* Greek Edition consists in this, that several various Readings are specified in the margent, but he might have added a greater number, and there are some which he ought not to have omitted, since he professed to publish *Erasmus's* Edition; he hath not mentioned, for example, any variation, neither in the margent of his Text, nor in his Notes on the 7th verse of the 5th Chapter of the first Epistle of Saint *John*, which he reads as it is in the present *Greek* Copies; nevertheless it is certain that *Erasmus* had not printed it in the first Editions of his New Testament, and that it is not extant in the most part of the *Greek* Copies. We shall take an occasion to discourse more at large concerning *Illyricus's* design in the third part of this Work, wherein we shall treat of the Commentators.

CHAP.

C H A P. XXIII.

Of the Versions of Pagninus and Arias Montanus. Of the Latin Bible used by the Inhabitants of Zurich.

P*agninus* who was more skilfull in the *Hebrew* Tongue than in the *Greek* hath thought fit to annex a Translation of the Books of the New Testament taken from the *Greek* to his Version of the Old, which he had composed from the *Hebrew*; but it seems that he affected to appear like a *Rabbin* in interpreting the Gospels; he hath changed the proper Names that are in the *Greek* Original, to dress them after the *Jewish* fashion; for he begins his Version of the Gospel of St. *Matthew* thus, *Liber generationis Jesuah Christi*; and hath transformed the other proper Names after the same manner, making use of such expressions as these, *Ischac*, *Jahacob*, *Jehudah*, *Nachsom*, *Bobaz*, *Selomoh*, *Miriam*, *ex qua genitus est Jesuah, qui dicitur Messiah*, (i. e. *Christus*.)

Hence we may judge that this learned Divine was very much possessed with his *Hebrew* notions, since having applied himself but little to the study of the *Greek* Tongue, he could not succeed in a Translation of the Books of the New Testament. Therefore I shall not spend time in giving a particular account of the errors into which he fell; this one instance in the 25th verse of the 8th Chapter of St. *John*, which he hath translated after this manner, *Principium, me dico, quia & loquor vobis*, sufficiently shews that he is not exact; he would have done better in annexing to his Translation of the Old Testament that which *Erasmus* had composed of the New, than in publishing a particular Version thereof; nevertheless he sometimes follows him, but without any discretion; as in the 13th Chapter of the *Acts*, verse 2. where he hath render'd with *Erasmus*, *cum autem illi sacrificarent*, but *when they sacrificed*; whereas he might have more iudiciously translated it according to the Vulgar, *ministrantibus autem illis*, but *as they ministred*. Moreover his Version of the New Testament is so little known, that the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* seem to be ignorant that it was extant, when they declare that his Version from the *Hebrew* was revised by Arias Montanus who hath added thereto an interlineary Translation of the New Testament from the *Greek*. Without doubt they had not seen *Pagninus's* Bible printed in the year 1528. for they might have read therein these words at the beginning of the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, *Evangelium secundum Matthaeum, interprete Sancte Pagnino Lucensi Sacrae Theologiae Doctore*, which discover that he hath no less translated the New Testament than the Old.

Ferdinandus de Escalante, a *Spanish* Divine, prefers the Version of *Arias Montanus* before that of *Pagninus*, he assures us also from the Testimony of *Petrus de Valentia*, that the Fathers of the Council of *Trent* had given orders to *Arias Montanus* to compose a new Translation of the Bible. But this Learned man (as I have elsewhere observed) had not formed to himself a just *Idea* of the method according to which the Sacred Books ought to be translated; and this is the cause that the same defects are apparent in his Version of the New Testament taken from the *Greeks*, as in that of the Old, from the *Hebrew*. He is to be commended indeed, for adhering to the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, whom he never abandons, but in those places where he judgeth that he hath not exactly expressed the *Greek* according to the Letter. But, besides that a too Grammatical Version is not the best, it is usefull only to young Students, that apply themselves to the learning of a Language, this is almost all the profit that can be reaped from the perusal of *Arias Montanus's* Translation. I would willingly know, for example, what reason obliged him to change the word *separatus* in the first Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*, which is in the Vulgar, into that of *discretus*; and in the 7th verse of this Chapter, *qui sunt Romæ*, into, *existentibus in Roma*. The most part of the other Alterations are of the same nature. This might be permitted to a School-master, but other rules ought to be observed in the Translation of Books. Moreover, he doth not seem to be exact in his Grammatical Constructions; for, without departing from this place, where hath he learnt to translate *τὸ θεοῦ δῶκεν* by *illo de- finito*? The Article (as it hath been already intimated) is not a Pronoun.

Epist. ad
Rom. c. 1.
vers. 4.

Leo Judæ, who is the principal Author of the *Latin* Version commonly called the Bible of *Zurich*, was not a *Jew* by birth, as *Gretserus* and several others have imagined; he was the Son of a Curate named *Johannes Judæ*. We shall apply to the Translation of the New Testament contained in this Bible all that hath been elsewhere declared concerning that of the Old. The Publishers thereof have inserted a Preface at the beginning, in which they shew so much moderation, that *de Escalante*, a *Spanish* Divine, who had only read this Preface, believed that *Leo Judæ* was really Bishop of *Zurich*, because he is indeed styled therein, *Episcopus Tigurinus*: He commends at the same time the other *Zuinglians* who have taken pains in this Work together with *Leo Judæ*. Since it will be hardly believed that a Panegyric on the Protestants of *Zurich* should be found in a Book of Divinity printed at *Venice* with the usual approbations, and revised by the Inquisitors; it will not be amiss to produce the express words of this *Spanish* Doctor, he assures us in speaking of (a) the Bible of *Zurich*, which he makes an Episcopal City,

(a) *Tigurina Biblia operâ & diligentia elaborata Leonis Tigurinae Ecclesie Episcopi, qui pio zelo fervens Latinam versionem moliri cepit — adjutus etiam plurimum operâ*

that it was composed by the Care and Diligence of *Leo* Bishop of that Place, who being excited by a pious Zeal, undertook this Translation, and that this holy man, not being able to finish this Version by reason of his extreme old Age, and the great Labour that he had already sustained, was assisted by some of his brethren, who were expert in the knowledge of the Languages and of the Holy Scriptures.

It is not to be admired that *De Escalante*, who had only read the Preface of this Bible, which he hath almost entirely copied out, hath bestowed such high commendations on the *Zuinglians*; he believed, that *Zurich* was certainly a Bishoprick, and that *Leo Judæ* and the others mentioned by him were true Bishops. But it is matter of wonder that *Jacobus Huldricus*, in a little Treatise which he hath written to vindicate this Bible against the Jesuit *Gretserus*, should make use of the Testimony of this Spanish Divine to authorize it. The Book (says he) of *Ferdinandus de Escalante* hath been approved by three most Illustrious Directors of Council, and there is at the beginning an elegant Epistle Dedicatory to Philip III. King of Spain. *Liber Ferdinandi De Escalante censura trium Illustrissimorum Consilii Directorum approbatur. Quin etiam Domino Philippo III. Hispaniarum Monarchiæ luculentâ præfatione dedicatus fuit.* As if the ignorance of this Spanish Doctor and of the Directors of the Venetian Council who believed that *Zurich* was an Episcopal See, and that *Leo Judæ* was Bishop thereof, were a good testimony to give authority to the Bible of *Zurich*. But after all, *Gretserus* might have discoursed on this subject with greater moderation.

Joann. Jac.
Hulder.
Vind. pro
Translat.
Bibl. Ti-
gur.

The Authors of this Translation have observed the same method in the New Testament as in the Old, keeping the middle way between the Versions which are too literal, wherein the expressions are somewhat rude, and those that are too remote from the letter; They have taken *Erasmus* for their Guide, whom nevertheless they often abandon. But they (b) speak of him very honourably in their Preface, in which they declare that they have exactly followed the Greek Origin-

Et industriâ clarissimorum virorum tam linguarum quàm rerum peritissimorum, quibus omnibus adminiculis Latinam suam translationem sincerè ad veritatem Hebraicam pro viribus suis conformare conatus est, quam ad optatum finem perducere non potuit propter ingentem tanti operis molem. Non enim corpusculum optimi viri senio jam debilitatum Et laboribus fractum diutius tantum oneris sustinere valebat. De Escal. Cyp. Concion. lib. 6. c. ult.

(b) Testamentum Novum doctissimè Et fidelissimè vertit beatissimæ memoria magnus ille Erasmus Roterodamus, qui, ne unquam corripì posset emendata ejus lectio, illustravit ipsum omni pietate Et eruditione refertissimis nec unquam satis laudatis annotationibus. Nihilominus collata est hæc nostra Novi Testamenti editio cum ipsa veritate Græca, è qua lectionis emendationem unice petendam esse omnes farentur, consultis interim aliquot per- vetustis exemplaribus Et versionibus, editione Hispaniensi sive Tolercana, Gallicanâ sive Parisiensi, Anglicanâ denique, Et reliquis quibusdam codicibus. Præf. Bibl. Tigur.

nal as their Rule, and that they have consulted some ancient Copies, the Edition of Cardinal *Ximenes* that of *Paris* and another of *England*, as also the ancient Versions.

It is certain that these Protestants have not been so great Lovers of Novelty, but that they have shewn much respect for Antiquity: although they profess to adhere to the Originals, they avouch nevertheless, that they have not so strictly confined themselves to the purity of the *Latin* Tongue, but that they have retained some old Expressions, which they considered as consecrated to the use of the Church, and as it were Apostolical: They reckon in the number of these Expressions *fides* for *fiducia*, *fidelis* for *fidens* or *verax*, and *benedictus* for *laudandus*; They blame those (c) who through too much perverseness reject certain forms of speaking that are peculiar to the Sacred Books, and who at the same time allow to every Profession its proper terms of Art, besides that there are some Phrases in the Holy Scriptures which cannot be elegantly expressed in another Language, without losing much of their gracefulness, and consequently of that which is mysterious. We ought then (say they) to have more regard to Religion, than to content those that are curious and nice. But notwithstanding these prudent precautions, they have not avoided this fault which they had reason to reprove, for though they have not affected to be too elegant, and have observed a mean betwixt barbarous Translations and those that are too polite, yet they have varied too much from certain expressions which are as it were canonized in the Western Churches. As for example, they generally neglect to insert in the Text of their Version the words *pœnitentia* and *pœnitentiam agite*; having put *resipiscite* instead thereof: as it is in the third Chapter of *St. Matthew*, verse 2. where we read in our Vulgar *pœnitentiam agite*, they have translated it *resipiscite*; nevertheless, they have added this Note in the margent, which serves as an explication. *Meditamini emendationem vitæ: hoc enim est Hebræis quod interpretantur agere pœnitentiam.* Take care to amend your lives; for this is what the Jews call to repent. They have likewise placed in the Text of their Translation in the 11th verse of this Chapter, *ad resipiscitiam*; and in the margent, *pœnitentiam*: however, they do not regard uniformity in this; for in the second Chapter of *The Acts of the Apostles*, verse 38. we find *pœnitentiam agite* in their Version, and *resipiscite* in the margent.

(c) *Videntur enim nobis quidam nimis esse morosi qui, cum omnibus professionibus sive facultatibus peculiaria quedam permittunt vocabula, solis ad divinis literis non concedunt, & utentes iis mirè suggillant. Quid, quod quedam in sacris locutiones sunt quæ vix possunt in alienam linguam tersè converti, ut non simul pereat bona pars gratiæ adeoque mysteris quod aliàs ex reliqua linguæ proprietate rectius faciliusque agnoscitur. At quis hic non videat potiore rationem habere oportere Religionis quàm linguæ exteræ auriumque plus satis delicatarum?* Ibid.

They have translated with *Erasmus* in the 8th Chapter of *St. John*, verse 25. *in primis*, where the Vulgar hath *principium*, and they have put *omnino* in the margent. *Id est* (say they) *omnino hoc ipsum sum quod jam dixi*; I am altogether that which I have now said. But the Greek word ἀρχὴ is better expressed in the Vulgar by *principium*, only a little Note might be annexed to shew what *principium* signifies in this place. There are divers other passages where they seem not to have sufficiently understood the force of the Greek words, and where they would have done better in following the Vulgar, than in departing from it; neither was it necessary for them to alter in an infinite number of places the expressions of the ancient Edition, to introduce others that are more purely *Latin*; for it sometimes happens that they thereby become weaker, this defect is predominant throughout this whole Translation, which is too much restrained to the purity of *Latin* words, and being too exquisite, is not more exact on this account. However, their exactness appears in this particular, that they have not presumed to insert any thing in their Version but what they firmly believed to be really in the Greek Original; therefore in the sixth Chapter of *St. Matthew*, v. 13. they have included within two Crotchets these words that are read in the Greek, *quia tuum est Regnum, & Potentia, & Gloria, in secula*; for thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, for ever; and which they acknowledge to be a Gloss.

Another proof of their Exactness is apparent in the first Epistle of *St. John*, Chap. 5. where they have not expressed the 7th verse, because they found it not in the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, nor in the best Greek Copies; particularly in an ancient Greek Manuscript of their Library of *Zurich*: *Nos* (say they in their Note on this place) *Cyrilli & aliorum veterum lectionem tum probatissimorum Græcorum codicum fidem sequi maluimus*: They have only inserted it in this Note after the same manner as it is printed in the Greek Edition of Cardinal *Ximenes*. *Henricus Bullingerus*, who published a Commentary on the Canonical Epistles at *Zurich* nine years before, conjectures (*d*) that this same verse is a Gloss which hath passed from the margent into the Text, and that this is the reason that it is not extant in some Copies. These *Zuinglians* have added little Notes in the margent of their Version of the New Testament, to explain the most obscure places, especially the *Hebraisms*, and this is not the least part of their Work. It will be convenient here to produce

la: 534.

(d) Illud membrum quod quædam incertum habent exemplaria, quoniam tres sunt — & in margine videtur irrepsisse. Annotavit id forsitan sciolus aliquis, qui non vidit aquâ significari cælestem doctrinam, sanguine redemptionem, & spiritu virtutem & administrationem divinam. Fecit itaque ex aqua Patrem, ed quod ex aqua omnia generari dicantur; ex sanguine Filium, ed quod sanguinem fuderit; sed ex spiritu personam Spiritûs Sancti. *Henr. Bulling. Comm. in Epist. I. Joann. cap. 5.*

some of them; In the 10th Chapter of St. Matthew, verse 41. where they read, *Prophetam nomine Prophetæ, a Propbet in the name of a Propbet*, as it is in the Greek, *ἐἰς ὄνομα*, they have remarked, that the Prepositions *ἐν* and *ἐν* are often put in the Scripture indifferently one for the other, because the Hebrews express them by one single Preposition *ב*, which also signifies *by reason*, so that *ἐἰς ὄνομα* (according to their judgment) is in this place the same thing as, *by reason of the names*.

In the 20th Chapter of the same Gospel, verse 28. where they translated, conformably to the Greek, *utque daret animam suam redemptionem pro multis*, to give his life a ransom for many; they have also observed in their Note, that the word *many* signifies *all*, according to the Genius of the Greek Tongue; at least it might be affirmed that this is the sense which the Hebrews likewise give to their Noun *רַב*. *Pro multis* (say they) *id est, pro tota multitudine hominum. Sic enim Græci solent τὸς πολλὰς vocare ipsam universitatem hominum; quamvis articulus absens nonnihil huic censui derogaret: nisi Hebræi quoque sic uterentur suo רַב. Indeed the Hebrew word רַב is generally taken for a multitude, and may be render'd all, or many, according to the different places to which it is applied; and although the signification of all is usually attributed thereto in the Dictionaries of the Hebrew Tongue, yet in its Original it imports only an universality, whether it be of all or many. The same signification ought to be ascribed to the Greek word πολλοὶ in the New Testament. As for example, in the 26th Chapter of St. Matthew, verse 28. where it is read, This is my blood which is shed for many, that is to say, for all.*

These Interpreters have sometimes supplied the defects of their Version in their Annotations; as in the 20th Chapter of St. Matthew, v. 23. where they translate, *Non est meum dare, sed (iis contigit) quibus est paratum à Patre meo; It is not mine to give, but (it happens to them) for whom it is prepared of my Father*; they have declared in the margent that it were more convenient to express it by *nisi* than *sed*, because the Grecians are accustomed to make use of the word *ἀλλὰ* instead of *nisi*; however, that it was not then necessary to insert it in the Translation. They might have intimated that in the style of the Sacred Books, *εἰ μὴ & ἀλλὰ*, that is to say, *unless* and *but* are indifferently put one for the other. In the first Chapter of the Gospel of St. John, verse 1. where they have retained the word *Verbum* as it is in the Vulgar, they explain in the margent, the proper signification of the Greek word *ῥῆμα*, and its relation to the Hebrew *דבר*: *ῥῆμα* (say they) *Græcis sermonem significat non dictionem aut unum verbum; sed Hebraica vox דבר utrumque significat, ut & Latinis verbum pro vocabulo & dicto seu sermone. ῥῆμα is used by the Grecians to express a speech, not a single word; but דבר in Hebrew signifies both, as verbum among the Latins is taken for a word, and for a saying or speech. Sometimes also they give a particular account in their Annotations of the propriety of words according to the Grammatical sense, as in the 28th Chapter of St. Matthew, where they have translated with the Vulgar,*

docete

docere omnes gentes, teach all Nations; they make this remark, that *docere, teach*, with respect to the Grammatical sense, is the same thing as *discipulare, or discipulos facere, make disciples*. In a word, these Notes chiefly tend to give light into the knowledge of the style of the Writers of the New Testament; and if they do not always succeed therein; at least they shew evident proofs of their good judgment in a time when people were not as yet very exact in Critical Enquiries relating to the Sacred Books.

Moreover, Robert Stephen chose their Version to insert it in the Body of the Bible commonly called *Biblia Vatabli*, which the Divines of Spain caused afterwards to be re-printed with very few Alterations. I know not on what grounds De Escalante could maintain his distinction betwixt two different Editions of the Latin Bible of Zurich; he pretends (e) that only that which is in a small Volume, was put in the new Index of prohibited Books, and that the reading of that which is *in folio* was permitted, observing the Censure thereof made by the Spanish Inquisition. I have seen two Editions of this Version that were published at the same time; one of which is *in folio*, and the other in *quarto*, but they differ not the least one from the other.

In 1543.

(e) *Cum autem typographorum incuria & injuria malevolorum codices quidam in lucem prodierint primis dissimillimi & corruptissimi, ideo æquum bonumque judicavi admonere concionatorem Catholicæ veritatis, quod in novo Indice prohibeantur hæc Biblia in mediocri forma, sed in folio conceditur copia legendi Tigurina excussa, servatâ formâ, ordine & censurâ, sicut præcepit reverendissimus Ferdinandus Valdesius Archiepiscopus Hispalensis. De Escal. lib. 6. Cyp. Cona. c. ult.*

C H A P. XXIV.

Of Sebastian Castalio's Latin Version. Beza's Objections against his Translation of the New Testament, Examined.

I Think it needless to repeat here, what I have said in another place of *Castalio*. His design was to present the world with a Latin Bible, in the purity of that Language, thereby to invite those to read it who dislike the stile of our Vulgar Edition: He has followed the same method in his Version of the New Testament he observ'd in his translation of the Old. 'Tis principally against his New Testament that the Doctors of *Geneva* vent their spleen: But his most violent Adversary was *Theodore Beza*, who understood the Greek well enough, but was not at all skilled in the Hebrew Tongue: And his skill in the former qualified him to discover more faults in the translation of the New Testament, than his ignorance in the later would permit him to see in that of the Old.

That which incensed these men most against *Castalio* was, that he had strenuously attacked the opinions then taught at *Geneva* concerning Grace and Predestination. The Calvinists, not being able to endure one who charged their Doctrines with impiety on this subject, resolved to destroy him: They vigorously decried both his Doctrine and Translation. We may be able to judge of the Spirit of that Party by what they have published in a Preface to an Edition of their New Testament, printed at *Geneva*, Anno 1560. * Time was when there was no French Translation of the Scripture, or at least none that deserved that name. But now Satan has raised some vain and idle men, who in translating have abused the Scriptures. If any desire an example, we will produce one instead of many, namely *Sebastian Castalio's* Translation of the Bible into Latine and French, a man well known in this Church, as well by his ingratitude and impudence, as their vain indeavours to reduce him to the right way.

These words plainly shew the stile and spirit of the Ministers of *Geneva*, who not being able to gain *Castalio* to their Party, which was a man of great repute for his learning, left no stone unturn'd to destroy him. He was ignorant and impudent for no other reason but that of disliking some of their opinions or rather novelties in Religion. For as I have said elsewhere, he was much better skilled in the Hebrew, Greek and Latine Tongues, as also in the stile of the Sacred Books, than any of the Doctors of *Geneva*. The greatest reproach they can cast upon him is that he too much affected politeness and elegance, and his chiefest design is to make the Apostles speak very elegantly; wherefore he sometimes ener-

vates their thoughts. In a word he deserves not the Character of a Translator of the Holy Scripture.

Nevertheless his version has not wanted its admirers. It had the effect he intended, which was to oblige those to read the Bible who before neglected it because of the extream rudeness and obscurity of the style. A Spanish Author of that time, who published a Treatise of the Translation of the Sacred Books into vulgar Languages (which was printed at Basile, in the Year 1556. and dedicated to a Cardinal,) praises Castalio's version for the best. *Quid, faith he, de Castalionis Translatione dicam? Annon hic omnes interpretes quicunque Libros Sacros in Latinum Converterunt ita vici, ut soli ipsi primas merito deferri debeant?* he also composed these Verses in its praise,

*Frid. Fur.
Benon. p.
326.*

Ibid.

*Nescio quis veterum voluit, Sermone Latino
Biblia cum priscis ut Loquerentur Avis.
Tentavit fecitque suis pro viribus omnem
Conatum. At fantur Biblia barbarice.
Eusebius Tentavit idem, tentavit Erasmus:
Frustra Opera est. Fantur Biblia Barbarice.
Pagninus tentavit idem cognomine Sanctes:
Frustra Opera est. Fantur Biblia barbarice
En tibi Castalio tentat, Cœlo auspice id ipsum
Successit. Ponunt Biblia barbariem.
O Opus Egregium! Latio Sermone loquuntur
Biblia Magni nunc Castalionis Ope.*

'Tis certain that if we consider only the Beauty of the Language, Castalio's Version deserves the praise this Spanish Author has given it, Tho Beza charges him with impurity in his Latine expressions. But indeed he ought not to make the Evangelists and Apostles speak the language of Catullus and Tibullus, which cannot be always proper to express their Thoughts. Both had reason to reproach him with this affectation, which is vicious in a Translator of the Bible. But this Calvinist has pusht his resentment much further in another Treatise which he published; which we are now coming to examine.

Beza having published the first Edition of his New Testament in the year 1556. with remarques; in several places thereof he sharply attacks Castalio's Translation. Castalio was so modest that he was silent several years. But in the end seeing that the Ministers of Geneva treated him as a lewd and impious wretch, he endeavoured to justify his Version, but principally the New Testament, in a small Tract which he printed at Basile, Anno 1562. entitled thus, viz. *Sebastianis Castellionis Defensio suarum Translationum Bibliorum, & Maxime Novi Fœderis.*

He tells us first in his Preface, that he did not pretend to be infallible in his Translation, having desired his Readers kindly to advertise him of his faults, that he had already corrected several, and would correct the rest when

when he knew them. In a word *Castalio* being none of those obstinate Translators that will not confess their faults; he mended several places in his following editions, and if he did not fully please the Ministers of Geneva, 'twas their opinion kept up their Choler.

Amongst the places which he corrected he observes that the 18th of St. Matthew in lieu of *incommodationes* in the first Edition, where the Greek was *Scandala*, he put *Offensiones*. He also changed these words *dicito Reipublica*, in the same Chapter to those of *dicito Ecclesia*, preserving the Greek word with the ancient Latin Interpreter. (a) He adds that he had not only altered the Version in those places where he had erred, but even where there was no fault, that there might be nothing left to offend any. He gives us an example of this last sort of correction in the words *Lotio & Genii* having in a former Edition of his New Testament in their room put *Baptismus & Angelus*. (b) There are other places (adds he) which some commend and others dislike, these I have not altered; it being impossible to please all the world.

Seb. Cast.
Defens. suar.
Translat.

ibid.

If *Castellio* should have altered his Version at the instance of their complaints, he must have began a new one, because it displeased throughout the whole. Nevertheless he deserves to be excused in some measure; because he had no other design in publishing his Version, than to engage an infinite number of persons to read it, who before would not look upon the Bible.

This was the Artifice he used to rid their hands of several obscene Books, which before they very much esteemed purely for the elegance and politeness of their stile. *Cupiebam*, says he, *extare Latiniorem aliquam nec non fidiorem & magis perspicuam Sacrarum Literarum translationem, ex qua posset eadem opera pietas cum Latino Sermone disci, ut hac ratione & tempore consuleretur, & homines ad legenda sacra pellicerentur.*

Beza had no regard to these reasons, but in a Tract which he published alone, he attacked *Castallio's* defence, and still traduced his Version as impious, as he had done before, *multis locis impiam & à Sancti Spiritus sententia prorsus discrepantem.* This is the encomium he affords it in a Letter addressed to the Ministers of *Basil*, placed at the beginning of his answer. He could not conceal from his Brethren the reasons which moved him to answer *Castellio's* defence printed in their City.

En. 1663.

Theod. Bez.
Epist. ad
Pastor. Ec-
cles. Basil.

(a) *Neque vero id in illis duntaxat locis feci, in quibus erratum videbatur, sed etiam in quibus erratum quidem non erat, sed aliquid tamen quosdam offendebar, cujusmodi est illud, quod cum quidem lotionis & genii verbis offenderentur, ego ubi hoc intellexi, in Novo Testamento ultima editionis, nam vetus jam impressum erat, verba baptisma & baptizare & angelus reposui.* Sebast. Cast. Defens. suar. Translat.

(b) *Fuerunt & alia pauca quæ cum nonnulli reprehenderent, alii approbarent, ego non mutavi: neque enim possum omnibus satisfacere.* Sebast. Cast. ibid.

(c) Under pretence (says he) of this defence, he has published very dangerous errors concerning Gods Decrees, Free-will, Original sin, the Word of God, the Spirit of God and Justification. This Calvinist indeed was not able to endure a Version of the New Testament, wherein he could find no ground for his opinions.

Ibid.

He (d) exaggerates the Controversie in the first ages of the Church with the *Pelagians*, and at this time with the *Semi Pelagians*, (for so he calls the Catholick Divines.) He endeavours to foil his Adversary with a long train of passages cited from St. *Augustin*; as tho *Castellio*, who was a Protestant as well as himself, was obliged to believe the disputations of that Father against *Pelagius*. But lastly we come to the particular reproaches in his Answer.

He supposes that 'tis requisite to a good Translator of the Holy Scripture, that he be well skill'd in the Hebrew and Greek Tongues, as also in the Language into which he translates; which is indeed very true. But he has wronged *Castellio* when he accuses him of the want of an exact knowledge in the Greek, Hebrew and Latin Tongues. As for the Hebrew, *Beza* himself could not in the least understand it, and therefore was no competent judge. And for the Greek, *Castellio* professed it at *Basil*, and his Works evince his excellent skill in it. I might say the same of the Latin; which was his peculiar study: But if he was guilty of any fault, it was affecting too great a Delicacy of stile. *Beza's* charging him with impurity in some words, is so trivial that it deserves no regard.

*Resp. Bez.
ad Defens.
Castell. p. 4.*

There have been very few Translators of the Bible so well acquainted with the three Languages in question as *Castellio*; if he was ignorant of any 'twas the French Tongue, wherein indeed he wanted the skill requisite to a Translator. I shall not examin whether he was a good Divine or no. The greatest reproach which *Beza* casts upon him is, that in a publick dispute concerning Predestination, he declared that he could not understand that mystery. But he might be a good Divine, and yet avow that he could not comprehend the *Mystery of Predestination*, especially as it was then taught at *Geneva*.

Beza charges him in the same place with temerity in reforming several expressions consecrated to the *Theology* of the *Holy Scripture*. This charge indeed seems to be better founded than his others. But he ought to take notice, that this fault is common to most of the Versions of his Party, and falls upon himself as well as *Castellio*, who differed not in this point from them, but only he takes more liberty than they. If he is

(c) Cum hujus defensionis prætexitu viderem gravissimos de firmitate divinorum decretorum, de libero arbitrio, de peccato originis, de verbo Dei, de spiritu, de justificatione errores spargi, &c. Theod. Bez. Epist. ad Past. Eccles. Basil.

(d) Notum est piis omnibus quanti sit momenti certamen de originis peccato, de quo contendit olim Ecclesia cum Pelagianis, nunc vero cum Semi-Pelagianis certamus. Bez. *ibid.*

culpable in this, the Doctors of *Geneva*, who he imitated, deserve more blame than he. We shall see hereafter that *Beza* has not practised this excellent Rule which he gives to *Castellio*; which was, that *he ought not without great reason change some terms which are proper to the Sacred Books.* (e) This is not (says he very well) my private opinion, but the sentiment of the best Ecclesiastical Writers, who when they spoke most elegantly of Sacred Things, would not in the least change those passages of Holy Writ which they cited. Bez. ib. p. 2.

In short, this is a fault which cannot be pardoned in *Castellio*, nor yet in *Beza*, tho indeed he is less guilty of it than the other. But yet he nevertheless exaggerates *Castellio*; for without doubt the Version of the Holy Books is not the Original. And therefore we must not with *Beza* charge him with changing the words of the Holy Spirit, or as he himself says, *divinam illam Spiritus Sancti eloquentiam.* 'Tis certain (to use the language of the Ministers of *Geneva*) that the Holy Spirit never spoke Latin.

'Tis for this reason that *Castellio*, in his Version, used *lotio & genii* instead of *Baptisma & Angeli*, without altering therein the expressions of the Holy Spirit. He thought that the words *Baptisma* and *Angeli*, which are in the Vulgar Edition, were rather Greek than Latin. And his design being to use no words in his Translation but what were purely Latin; he used *Lotio* and *Genii*, and an infinite number of the like. We can only accuse him of changing some expressions, which, after a sort, were become sacred in all the Western Churches by the custom of several Ages: which was sufficient to render them Latin altho they were *Grecized* words.

Beza blames *Castellio* for another fault, and not without some reason, 'twas that under pretence of publishing a Version in the greatest purity of the Latin Tongue, he changed those Hebraisms which ought to be preserved in an exact Translation, it being impossible to express them with the same vigour in another Language. Besides (f) the purity of the true Religion being a long time preserved among the Hebrews, their Language has something particular and natural to express Sacred things; and therefore 'tis necessary that other Languages should borrow those words. Bez. ib. p. 6.

Castellio answers to this Objection, that the Apostles have kept several Hebraisms which came not from the Holy Spirit, who no more affected Hebraisms than *Grecisms*, *Neque enim plures facit Spiritus Sanctus, He-* Sebast. Cast. Defens. suar. Translat.

(e) *Hæc est non tam mea, quam summorum & Orientis & Occidentis Theologorum sententia, qui etiam quum volunt polite & ornate, & suo quodam modo de rebus sacris differere, tamen quoties Scripturas citant, neque verba innovant.* Bez. Resp. ad Defens. Castell. p. 2.

(f) *Sicut id unica Hebræorum gente diu conservata fuit veræ Religionis puritas: ita etiam eorum idioma in sacris rebus explicandis habet peculiare & nativum quiddam quod ab Hebræis necesse est cæteras linguas sæpissime mutuari.* Bez. ibid.

braisimos quam Gracisimos; but only 'twas very difficult for those that were native *Hebrews* to relinquish intirely their *Hebraisms*. He adds, that he does not in the least condemn those who retain'd the *Hebraisms* in their *Translations*; but (says he) this inconvenience attends it, that the reader cannot understand them, the *Language* being foreign to him, and therefore is obliged to have recourse to notes to explain them: and that it is no less dangerous to explain them in the *Notes* than in the *Text* of the *Version*.

But this does not always hold true. For by preserving the *Hebraisms*, or at least those which cannot be rendred into another *Language*, the Reader is accustomed by degrees to the stile of the *Scripture*, in which there is something peculiar, and less subject to error. We ought to have so much respect for the *Sacred Books*, as not to translate them too literally to the intent that they may be understood. There is a medium between literal versions, like those of the *Jews*, and those *Polite* and *Elegant* ones which swerve too far from the *Letter*. Now *Castalio's* fault was the neglect of this *Medium*.

Beza indeed had reason to object, that *Ancient Words* were better understood than *Modern* ones, so that tho there was no real difference betwixt the sense of *Baptismus* and *Lotio*, *Angelus* and *Genius*, *Fides* and *Confidentia*, *Synagoga* and *Collegium*: yet 'tis better to retain the *Ancient Words*, *Baptismus*, *Angelus*, *Fides* and *Synagoga*. Nevertheless it must be owned, that they are ancient on no other account than their having been used in the first *Latin Versions*, and since retained in the *Western Church*.

This objection would be of more force in the mouth of a *Catholick* than in *Beza's*. *Castellio* might have replied that *Beza* himself has not exactly observed that rule in his *Translation* of the *New Testament*, which he prescribes to others. In effect when *Beza* blames him for changing the word *Mediator* (which was a consecrated term) to *Sequester*, he objects against *Beza* his using *Internuntius* twice in *Gal. 5. 19, 20.* instead of *Mediator*.

'Tis easie to clear him of that impiety the *Ministers* of *Geneva* cast upon him for believing that the *Holy Spirit* did not dictate words but things to the *Apostles*, and that they were permitted to express what the *Holy Ghost* dictated, in what words they pleas'd. *Beza* addressing himself to *Castellio*, accuses this opinion of impiety, *Quid dicam*, says he, *Castellio? Impietatis viam ingrederis, cum de Apostolorum scriptis ita sentis & loqueris.* We have prov'd at large in the first part of this work, that the *Holy Spirit* did not dictate to the *Apostles* words but things. And this sentiment is so far from impiety, that the contrary cannot be defended.

I wish only that *Castellio* had not swerv'd so far from the stile of the *Apostles*, under pretence of rendering their expressions more clear and plain. For he sometimes changes or rather enervates their thoughts.
Never-

Nevertheless it must be owned, that he is sometimes so happy in his alterations, as to render somethings more clear in his Version, that were obscure and intricate in the Original. For example, we can much better understand those words, Matt. 24. 2. *Nemo prorsus evaderet*, in his Translation, than as the vulgar literally expresses it, *non fieret salva omnis caro*. If he had been so fortunate in expressing the other Hebraisms, we should injure him in accusing him of reforming the stile of the Apostles. For whilst he retained their sense he might lawfully make them speak clear Latin.

I shall pass by here *Beza's* injurious reproaching *Castellio*, for translating *ἡ Ματθαῖος* *Autore* *Matthæo*. I have shewed elsewhere that this expression signifies no more than that St. *Matthew* writ that Gospel which passes under his name; the Latin word *Autor*, in this place, importing the same with *Scriptor*.

He also objects against *Castellio* his using the verb *vaticinari* instead of *prophetare*; and that if he would have chang'd the ancient word, *predicere* had been more to the purpose than *vaticinari*, which answers to the Greek word *μαντεύεσθαι*, and not to *προφητεύειν*. *Castellio* answers, that the Authors of the Greek Version of the Old Testament (which the Apostles followed) were not very exact in their choice of the Greek word *προφήτης*, which they make answer to the Hebrew *נביא*. And further, that he disliked the word *predicere* because it related only to future things, and that the Divinely inspired Prophets treat as well of things present as future. But supposing this remark to be true, he had better have made use of *prophetare* in that copious sense the Seventy, and afterwards the Apostles used the Greek verb *προφητεύειν*, than have put another in its place.

Beza has not objected against what *Castellio* further advances, viz. that the Apostles following the Seventy, made use of some expressions not very exact; at least that it could not be pretended that these Ancient Interpreters were inspired in their Version. For 'tis certain that the Evangelists and Apostles imitated their stile, and frequently used their very expressions.

Yet the liberty which *Castellio* took of adjusting the Apostles words according to his pleasure, and often changing them for others, more accommodated to his prejudices is inexcusable. 'Tis true, that when *Beza* made this objection, he charged him with falling into the same error himself. But this reply does not justify him at all; for *Beza's* faults cannot be his excuse. *Beza* had sufficient reason to accuse his Version of Luke 2. 34. as false. *Scito hunc multorum vel casui vel resurrectioni in Israelitis destinatum esse*, because there is no disjunctive particle in the Original. 'Tis true indeed that we find sometimes in the Greek MSS. *ἢ vel, for &* &: But this pretext will not warrant the changing of two particles to force the sense to his fancy.

Castellio also might have better rendred *Luke* 7. 30. according to the Vulgar, *Consilium Dei spreverunt in semetipfos*, than by these words, *Dei Consilium quantum in se fuit resciderunt*. For without regarding what *Beza* says of the Efficacious will of God; 'tis far more natural in this place to translate *eis eaulēs* by *in semetipfos*, than by *quantum in se fuit*.

'Tis true that in the stile of the Seventy and the Evangelists the proposition *eis* is put for *in*, and that the the Greek Transcribers do use them promiscuously. According to this Rule *eis eaulēs* would signifie the same with *in eaulōis* : But it appears that this sense will not pass in this place.

It seems *Castellio* design'd to keep as distant as possible from the Opinions of the Genevian Ministers, and therefore affected a manner of rendring some places in the New Testament directly opposite to them : Wherefore we ought to be careful in the reading of his Version. Nevertheless *Beza*, who was bigotted to the sentiments of his Party concerning Predestination, Free Will, &c. has not always rendred him justice. The surest course therefore is to follow the Ancient Interpreter, who was exempted from prejudices of this nature.

'Tis worth remarking that *Castellio* several times prefers *Simon Colinaus's* edition of the New Testament before other Greek Editions. 'Tis by this he defends himself when answering *Beza's* charge of rendring *II. Pet.* 2. 14. in a sense contrary to all the Greek Exemplars. I have followed in this place, says he, *Colinaus's* Edition, as I have remarked in my Note. But *Beza* pretends that he was to blame in following that Edition. (g) To which, says *Beza*, I have no regard, when destitute of the consent of other Exemplars to back its authority, because I know 'twas mended by the sole conjectures of a person indeed well skilled in the Greek Tongue, but without recourse to any Manuscript.

Bez. Resp.
ad Defens.
Sebast. Castell.
p. 222.

He tells us, that whereas the Greek word is, *ἀναπαύεις* in the 2^d Epistle of *St. Peter* in the ordinary Greek, *Castellio*, according to *Colinaus*, reads it *ἀναπαύεις*, and translates it *perpetui*, joining it to *ἀπασις peccati* immediately following. But this is not only done in *Colinaus's* Edition, but he cites in his Notes the Ancient Latin Interpreter, who also translated it *incessabilis delicti*. In *Genitivo*, says he, *recte legit vetus Interpres*. And seems to have good reason to prefer this reading, which he thought very ancient, to that of the ordinary Greek. In effect this is confirmed by a Manuscript at *Rome*, as appears by the *Oxford New Testament*.

In the 18th verse of the same Chapter, *Castellio* prefers *Colinaus's* Edition before the ordinary. For where we read *ὅντας*, certe he reads

(g) *Colinaei exemplar non magni facio, nisi aliorum codicum consensu adjuvetur, quoniam rescivi multa fuisse in eo a quodam aliqui Græcæ linguæ doctissimo ex solis conjecturis emendata.*
Bez. Resp. ad Defens. Sebast. Castell. p. 222.

with *Colineus* ὁ λῆγας, *propemodum*, which indeed is confirm'd by the Ancient Latine Interpreter, and several Greek MSS. This is sufficient, That he has not blindly follow'd *Colineus*'s Edition. He has also retain'd the 1st. Ep. *John*, c. 1. v. 7. which the other left out, being content to remark, that 'tis not in several Copies.

'Tis needless to regard the reproaches wherewith *Beza* has loaded *Castellio* in his answer; all his Books are fill'd with Investives against those who dislike his Sentiments. *Castellio*, on the other side, has testified his moderation, in candidly answering the *Calvinists*, who discharged their Indignation against him. This, I say, prov'd him no such person as their Libels represented him, and that his Conscience did not reproach him of any Irreligion. *Certe ego, says he, non sum talis qualem vos me traducitis, sed Deum sincera conscientia religiose colo.*

Seb. Cast.
Defens.
suar.
Translat.
Biblizzor.

CHAP. XXV.

Of Theodore Beza's Version in general. An Examination of the Epistles, or Prefaces, before some Editions of his Version.

BEZA's Version has gain'd more esteem amongst the Protestants, than all other Latine Translations of the New Testament: He is the Interpreter in favour with the *Calvinists*. Before him, they of *Geneva* only amended other Translations. *Calvin* not being sufficiently skill'd in *Critick* and the Greek Tongue, to undertake this task, contented himself with adjusting the Translations of others, according to his own Ideas. *Beza*, on the contrary, applying himself to the study of the Greek and Latine Tongues; if he had been less prejudic'd by his *Calvinism*, had shunn'd several Faults, which those who declare for a Party, commonly fall into.

He publish'd the first Edition of his New Testament, with Notes, Anno 1556. I have not seen it, but if we may believe *Castellio*, who is therein abus'd, the Remarks contain little besides invectives against *Origen*, *Erasmus*, and some other Learned Men. He had much better, says *Castellio*, have printed those few things of his own apart. *Consultius meo judicio fecisset, si pauca illa sua seorsim excudenda curasset.* It does not appear that he profited any thing by this good advice, for the same Spirit reigns in all his other Editions, where his Remarks are.

Beza, who design'd to establish the Opinions taught at *Geneva*, concerning Predestination, Grace, and Free-Will, thought necessary for the accomplishment of his design, to attack the Greek Fathers, chiefly *Origen*; neither could he omit *Erasmus*, who preferr'd them before St.

Augustine, and *Castellio*, who openly opposed their Calvinistical Sentiments. We shall take opportunity to speak more at large of his Notes in the following part of this *Critical History*: 'tis sufficient here to touch upon them in general, as far as they respect his Version, which is sometimes limited by his Remarks.

He dedicated this great Work to *Elizabeth Queen of England*. In his Edition 1564. he tells us the reasons which induc'd him to publish a new Latine Translation of the New Testament, and the method he had followed therein. He follows the steps of other modern Translators, in lessening, as much as in them lies, the ancient Latine Edition of the Western Churches, to give the more authority to their new Versions.

Bez. Epist.
ad Elizab.
Reg. Angl.

(a) He accuses the Latine Interpreter of frequently swerving from the Greek, of being obscure, and not observing exactly his Original: Further, that it had not pleas'd the Learned, and had plung'd the Ignorant into divers gross Errors.

But it is easie to prove the greatest part of these Objections ill grounded, and on the contrary, that *Beza* himself swerves oftentimes from the Original, at the same time when he slights the ancient Interpreter of the Latine Church. 'Tis no more than what Protestants of great Judgment in the *Critick* of the Scripture, have made evident by several Examples.

He proves in the same Epistle, by *St. Augustine*, *St. Ambrose*, and *St. Hilary*, That the Ancient Fathers, who had also Learning, were not so tied to the Vulgar Bible, as not to dissent from it, when they judg'd it fit so to do. He brings also the example of *St. Hierome*, who by the command of Pope *Damasus*, review'd the Ancient Latine Edition, in the same manner that *Origen* corrected the Greek Version of the Old Testament. *Ad Hieronymum autem*, saith he, *quod attinet, si vetus illa Editio tam erat emendata, quam vos esse vultis, cur ipse Damasi Romani Episcopi hortatu idem in illa tentavit, quod olim Origenes in Veteris Testamenti Græca Interpretatione?*

But if he had design'd to imitate these Ancient Fathers, he should have contented himself with following their example, in correcting some places of the Old Edition, which he did not think so exact. They made no others, but made use of those which were read in their Church, contenting themselves with some amendments in their Works; which liberty the Catholicks at present take in their Books and Commentaries on the Bible; although the Version of our Church is much better than 'twas in the times of *St. Hilary*, *St. Ambrose*, and of *St. Augustine* himself.

(a) Hoc quidam constat sæpe Vulgatam illam Editionem a Græcis discedere, sæpe obscure multo interpretari, quædam prætermittere, quædam adjicere, ut eam minime mirum sit eruditis hominibus nunquam satisfecisse, imperitiis autem multis magnos errores objecisse. Bez. Epist. ad Elizab. Regin. Angl.

St. Hierom, indeed, review'd the Ancient Edition of the New Testament, which needed Correction. But *Beza* ought to have been inform'd that the vulgar Edition, which the Catholick Doctors defend against the Protestants as a good Translation, is not that old Edition which they used in the *West*, before *St. Hierome* corrected it. It does not appear, that he perfectly understood the Subject he handled, when he compares this Father's revising of the New Testament in *Pope Damasus's* time, with *Origen's* reviewing the *Septuagint*. *Origen* changed nothing in the Translation, but only corrected the Faults incident to it by the length of time. *St. Hierome*, on the contrary, assures us, That he reform'd the old Latine Edition of the New Testament, because he did not think it exact and conformable to the Original. He also acknowledges, that he has left some Faults, being unwilling to make too many alterations.

Beza principally commends those who labour'd in our latter times to publish Translations of the New Testament from the Greek Text, without a too scrupulous confinement to the Ancient Latine Edition. (b) But as the Greek Exemplars differ very much from one another, he tells us that the modern Translators had no great number of these Exemplars, whereby to judge of the best Readings, or that they did not sufficiently apply themselves to observe them. I see, says he, that neglecting those which were not accommodated to them, they only noted those which pleas'd them; when they ought to have all the divers readings in particular, and leave every one at their liberty of choosing those they thought best. *Bez. Ibid.*

Nothing can be more judicious than this observation: *Beza* had very good reason to wish that all the Translators of the New Testament had followed this method; but indeed he has not kept close to it himself. For though he collected a great number of divers Readings of the Greek Copies in his Notes, which none before ever did, yet he has omitted several, for fear of offending his Brethren. He is not always very happy in his choice of those he prefers to put in the Text of his Version; and the reflections he makes upon them in his Notes, are sometimes not very exact. But after all, we are oblig'd to him for publishing a great number of *divers Readings*, which are not adapted to the humour of the Ministers of *Geneva*.

(b) *Ut in genere de omnibus loquar, cum in ipsis Græcis codicibus maxima sit interdum varietas, videntur omnes vel satis multis exemplaribus non fuisse instructi, vel non satis de hac annotanda fuisse solliciti. Video enim illos, ceteris neglectis, ea demum plerumque annotasse quæ ipsi probabant, cum singula potius annotare oportuerit, ut suum quique judicium relinqueretur.* *Bez. Epist. ad Eliz. Reg. Angl.*

'Tis also very commendable in him that he reproves *Erasmus* (c) of undeservedly reprehending the old Latine Interpreter in several places, for swerving from the Greek Text. I confess, says *Beza*, that he disagrees with those Greek Exemplars which *Erasmus* had, but I find he agrees with other very ancient Greek Copies. And his Translation is very good in several places where he differs from the ordinary Greek, because he has followed more correct Copies than we have at present.

This observation affords a great advantage to the Ancient Version of the Church, above the modern Translations which are conformable to the ordinary Greek. But if *Erasmus*, who never saw the old Greek Exemplars, is culpable for differing from the Ancient Interpreter in several places; *Beza* is rather more faulty than he, because he had the Antique Copies in his hands, and yet sometimes could not forbear preferring the Modern.

'Tis true, as I have proved elsewhere, that those Ancient Greek Exemplars, which he questions, are not better than the others, because they pretend to a greater Antiquity. *Beza* was not so well acquainted with them, as to make a Judgment of them, which is the reason that his Critick is less exact in his Notes. His observation in the same place of his Preface, concerning the Citations of the Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, both Greek and Latine, is very true; namely, That they did not always cite in their Works the very words of Scripture; and therefore he had reason to affirm, That we ought not to correct the Text of the New Testament by their Citations, because they were not always true, and frequently made as they occur'd in their Memory: They also often accomodated the Passages they cited to their Subject, and therefore sometimes omitting some, and adding other words; which they did by reason they ordinarily Paraphras'd, or Explain'd, the Scriptures in those places.

In regard to the manner of his Translation, he professes to keep close to the Original, and to render the propriety of the Greek Words, as well as he could, without using synonymous Terms. *Verborum*, says he, *proprietaem adeo studiose sum sectatus, ut etiam a synonymis quoad ejus fieri potuit libens abstinnerim*. Yet his method of Translating is very free; for endeavouring perspicuity in some obscure places, he assumes too much liberty for an Interpreter. Nor has he kept as much

(c) *Quam immerito veterem Interpretem multis reprehendit tanquam a Græcis dissentientem. Dissentiebat, fateor, ab iis exemplaribus quæ ille nactus erat; sed non uno loco compertimus aliorum codicum, & quidem vetustissimorum, auctoritate eam interpretationem minus quam ille reprehendit. Quinetiam aliquot locis animadvertimus veteres Interpretis lectionem, quamvis cum nostris Græcis exemplaribus interdum ei non conveniat, tamen ipsis rebus multo melius quadrare, nempe quod ille quisquis fuit emendatius aliquod exemplar nactus esset.*
Bez. ibid.

as he could the expressions of the Ancient Interpreter, though he assures us he did. *Erasmus* swerves far less from him, and yet his Style is not barbarous, but less affected than *Beza's*, and he has express'd the Characters of the Original far better than he.

Though *Beza* understood Hebrew and Syriack no more than *Erasmus*, yet he had this advantage over him, that he lived at a place where several understood them, and consequently had opportunity of consulting them upon occasion; wherefore he took care to preserve a good part of those Hebraisms, with which the Style of the New Testament abounds. He says, that he had rather neglect the purity of the Latine in these, than take the freedom *Castellio* had done, because they have I know not what of force, especially in Religious Affairs. This observation is very judicious; but he has left us room to doubt whether he practis'd it so exactly as he pretends. 'Tis certain, he has not been so free on these occasions, as *Castellio*; yet he could not forbear lanching out sometimes, which any man is subject to, that is led by the Eyes of others.

It cannot be denied but that *Beza* was very well acquainted with the Greek and Latine Tongues, and had several good Greek Manuscripts, which were great helps to a faithful Version of the New Testament. But these were not sufficient, the Evangelists and Apostle's Greek is full of Chaldaisms, which he could not meet with in those prophane Authors he had read. He wanted some of the qualifications requisite to a good Translator of the Books of the New Testament: he was not well enough read in the Septuagint, which would have been more useful to him, than those prophane Writers he cites in his Notes.

He has publish'd few Editions of his Version wherein he has not made some amendments; *Castellio* reproaches him with falling into the same faults he blam'd in others; giving him an Example in his sometimes Translating the Word *μεσίτης*, otherwise than *Mediator*, by which he pretended it ought to be rendred: He observes that he has used *internuntius*, Gal. 3. 19. *Beza* replies, That he spoke in this place of *Moses*, and not of JESUS CHRIST; and that he made use of *internuntius* in this place, to distinguish the quality of Mediator. Besides, he adds, that in his second Edition, then under the Press, he chang'd it to *Mediator*, that he might not oppose some excellent Writers that had explain'd these words of St. *Paul* concerning JESUS CHRIST.

I have not seen this second Edition he mentions; he writ his answer to *Castellio* in 1563. And I have an Edition of his New Testament in 1565. where he has *internuntius* in this place; and I can see no alterations in six or seven later Editions. In the first he has this Note upon the passage in Question: *Ego malui internuntium dicere hoc in loco, non ut innovarem Mediatoris vocabulum Theologorum auribus familiare, sed ut Moſen a Chriſto diſtinguerem.*

This single place is sufficient to evince, that *Beza* is not exempted from those Faults which he objects against the Author of the Vulgar, and *Erasmus*, which he blames for Translating that same word several ways: 'tis true, there may be reason for so doing; but the difference betwixt *Moses* and JESUS CHRIST, does not prove that he ought to render the Greek Word *μεσίτης* any otherwise than by *Mediator*, if this word be of the number of the consecrated Terms among Divines. 'Tis certain that JESUS CHRIST was a Prophet different from the other Prophets; though we use the Latine Word *Propheta* in all places, for the Greek, *προφήτης*; so he ought to have observ'd in his Note, that JESUS CHRIST was another kind of Mediator than *Moses*. Those that are unacquainted with the Greek Tongue, when they read this Version, cannot but think that St. *Paul* did not use *μεσίτης*, but another word in this place.

'Tis to be wish'd that this Translator had follow'd the Rules which himself prescribed, for making a good Version of the Sacred Books, in his Letter to Queen *Elizabeth*; (d) namely, That those Versions are best which differ least from the Greek and Hebrew; and wherein that divine and admirable Simplicity, peculiar to the Holy Books, is preserv'd, only shunning a barbarous Stile. If he had only avoided this barbarity of Stile, he had kept more close to the Original, and swerv'd so far from the Vulgar.

The Calvinistical Party have exalted *Beza's* reputation, though indeed he deserv'd but a moderate Encomium: He was better at declaiming than Criticising. There can be nothing more rash then a Letter, in form of a Preface, to the Prince of *Condy*, and all the French Nobility, at the beginning of his Greek and Latine Edition, 1565. in 8°. where he tells his Readers, That the pure Word of God was confin'd only to the Lake of *Geneva*. He herein shows a great contempt of Antiquity. Those things, says he, that are ancient now, cannot be new at another time.

Here he takes occasion to declaim against the Ancient Councils and Fathers; he endeavours to overthrow all Traditions, and treats the common Belief of all the Churches, as publick Errors. *Illis autem quid facias*, says he, *qui publicum Errorem pro regula Religionis sequendum arbitrantur? qui Patrum & consuetudinis inania nomina quibusvis rationibus & testimoniis opponunt?* If we, who believe the true Religion, could not find it any where but in the Scriptures, according to those of *Geneva*, those who receive the Traditions of their Fathers would be *Cabalists*.

Quo propius abest a Græcis & Hebræis Latina Interpretatio, eo mihi quidem magis probanda videtur: ita tamen ut simplicitate illa sermonis servata, quæ in his Spiritus Sancti oraculis plane divina est & admirabilis, asperum illud & horridum scribendi genus vitetur. *Bez.* Epist. ad Eliz. Regin. Angl.

and *Talmudists*. But 'tis almost time to leave this declaimer, who was more fit to write common Places of Controversie, than to Translate the New Testament.

If we believe him, before his time, there was no exact Version of the Scriptures, either amongst the Greeks or Latines, and all Antiquity lay groveling in Error. The Greeks did not understand Hebrew, and the Latines were not only ignorant of that, but several amongst them were as little acquainted with the Greek, which, as he said, plung'd them into gross Errors. (e) Wherefore he was oblig'd, at great expence, to get several Copies, and to examine what several Learned Men had writ on that Subject, but chiefly those skill'd in the Languages, being certain that that Age had produc'd more great Men, than the Church had enjoy'd since the Apostles time.

Bez. Præf.
N. T. Gr.
& Lat. ed.
in 8°. an.
1565.

According to this account, the Eastern and Western Churches, for fifteen or sixteen hundred Years, had none to compare with *Theodore Beza*. *Origen* and *St. Hierome* were ignorant of the Greek and Hebrew Tongues: there's none deserves regard beside this Oracle of *Geneva*: the mischief is, that a great many won't take him at his word. He vaunts, that he has made the difficulties of the Apostolical Writings plain. He treats those as ignorant People, who find *St. Paul's* Stile so difficult and embarrass'd. *Apud Paulum, quo tamen scriptore nihil fuit unquam in scribendo judiciosius, infinita anantapodota & hyperbata imperitissimi homines jampridem somniant.*

But I am deceiv'd if we don't now find those difficulties in the Epistles of *St. Paul*, which *Origen*, and several other ancient Writers have remark'd. Whatsoever care *Beza*, and the other Ministers of *Geneva*, have taken to explain the Scriptures in their Versions and Commentaries, yet we ought always to distrust those whose Interpretations don't preserve the Character of the Original.

Though they vaunt of having amongst them several great Men, who excelled in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, yet they have not an exact Latine Version of the Bible. *Tremellius* is their chief Interpreter for the Old, and *Beza* for the New Testament. Both which Versions they usually join together, and they have both been Printed several times, in divers places. *Andrew Rivet* prefers these to all others, in an Edition which he publish'd. *Inter alios, says he, qui egregiam rei navarunt operam, & de Ecclesia Christiana bene meriti sunt, Immanuel Tremellius—& Franciscus Junius Biturix vir doctissimus & diligentissimus conjunctis operis, donis ad id necessariis instructissimi, observata lin-*

(e) Hæc me igitur causa impulit ut collatis quam diligentissime possem variis codicibus, & expensis quamplurimorum hominum doctorem sententiis, eorum præsertim quos nostra hæc ætas linguarum peritos, multo certe plures ac doctiores tulit, quam antea unquam repetita usque ab Apostolorum temporibus memoria habuerit Ecclesia, eos saltem nonnihil sublevarem qui puriorem interpretationem desiderant. Bez. Præf. N. T. Gr. & Lat. edit. in 8°. ann. 1565.

que sanctæ proprietate, & idiotismis sedulo expensis, eam versionem veteris Testamenti concinnarunt, quæ se doctis jam diu probavit, maxime sermonis puritate linguæ accommodatâ quantum fieri potuit ad rerum majestatem. Quod idem à venerabili Beza in Novi Testamenti versione observatum fuit.

'Tis true if we believe the prejudic'd report of the Calvinists, these two Translations deserve the Encomium *Rivet* gives them. But if we judge fairly, and according to their agreement with or dissent from the Originals, they are not so exact. This is also the opinion of the most learned and sincere of their party concerning them. If they ever had any approbation amongst the Protestants of *England*, 'twas when they were not well examin'd. I need not repeat here what I have said elsewhere concerning *Tremellius's* Translation.

As for *Beza*, I own that the Calvinists party, which has been very strong in that Kingdom, have very much credited his Version, and it has been several times printed there. I have seen an Edition thereof in 8°. at *London*, in 1579. publish'd by a Professor of Divinity that came from *Geneva*. He assures us in an Epistle at the beginning, (f) that *Beza's* Translation is the best, and therefore us'd in the Church and Schools instead of the Vulgar, 'till there should be publish'd a better, which he passionately desires. But we may remark, that this was one of *Beza's* Friends, whom he had also intrusted with the Translation of his small Notes into French.

The English Protestants, who are not infected with Calvinisme, dislike *Beza's* Translation, because it seems to be done for no other end than to abolish the ancient Version of the Church. *John Lancelot*, then Bishop of *Ely*, oblig'd *John Boys*, Canon of the same place, to defend the Ancient Latine Version against the Modern Translators. We have spoken before concerning this Learned Canon, and of his critical Remarks upon the Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles, in which he principally designs to attack *Beza's* Traduction.

The Protestant Author, who publish'd this Book at *London*, 1656. has plac'd an Advertisement before it directly opposite to the sentiments of the *Genevan* Ministers. He has a respect to the Authority of the Church, and a veneration for the Ancient Fathers. *Sua sit*, says he, *almae matri Ecclesiae facta testis autoritas. Suus sit sanctis Patribus saluus honor, quorum veneranda canitiei si qui non assurrexerint, vel placitis contraxerint, nec filiorum in censum illis, nec fratrum nobis venient.*

(f) *Novi Testamenti Bezae versio omnium castissima est & purissima. Itaque meum esse existimavi procurare, illa non tantum ut extaret, sed etiam velut a Vulgata Versione quam minimum abest, sic in ejus locum in Schola & in Ecclesia succederet, donec, quod ut aliquando fiat a Deo peto, ex Principum Christianorum voluntate, aut illa ipsa, aut melior al qua communibus quasi suffragiis ab omnibus reciperetur.* Petr. Losel. Vill. Epist. ad Comit. Hunting. ann. 1573.

This Language is far different from that of *Beza*. This English supports himself by his pretended Reformation, founded on the ruin of Antiquity. He complains against them that (g) under the pretext of Reformation, they had introduc'd all the Novelties wherewith *England* is fill'd, and that they had established a fifth Gospel, as if they had no other design than the subversion of the Christian Faith. (h) He adds that the antient Interpreter was not so ill us'd, before some Translators rendred new versions with too much precipitation, which displeased several Learn'd men, as well skill'd in polite learning as in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. This is the censure which the most Learn'd Englishmen of this Age have pass'd upon the modern Translations of the New Testament, especially that of *Beza*. For 'tis that alone which *Boys* attacks in his Book, how justly let us now see.

CHAP. XXVI.

Beza's Version particularly examin'd : concerning the Judgment of John Boys Canon of Ely.

THERE has nothing appear'd more exact against the later Latin Translations of the New Testament, and chiefly against *Beza's*, than this Treatise which I mention'd in the former Chapter. His design was to defend the Antient Interpreter of the Western Churches, against the new Translations, as appears by the Title of his Book: *Veteris Interpretis cum Bezâ aliisque recentioribus Collatio in quatuor Evangeliiis & Apostolorum Actis, in quâ annon sapiens absque justâ causâ* *J. Boys.* *hi ab illo discesserint, disquirunt.* *Beza's* Version making a greater noise in *England* than the rest, *Boys* produces most of his examples from that.

(g) *Nulla nunc dierum allubescit reformatio, nisi subversis adruta usque substructionibus, nova consurgunt omnia. Imo nova adeo nunc spiramus suspiramusque omnia, nova lumina, Angliam novam, novum orbem, quintam novamque monarchiam, novum quintumque, si Deo placeat (spiritus) Evangelium; ac sic abjuratis orthodoxorum partibus in castra concefferamus Novati, novatoresque audiremus rectius quam reformati. Monit. ad Lect. quod præmitt. Collat. vet. Interpr. cum recent.*

(h) *Vetus nunquam tam acceptus est male, atque post festinatas unam, alteram, plures versiones, novas. Ægre habuit hoc e doctis multos, haud paucos quibus litera tum humaniores omnes, tum sacra præsertim cordi. Ibid.*

He takes notice first of *Matt. 1. v. 16.* where the vulgar has it, *de quâ natus est Jesus*, *Beza* renders it, *ex quâ genitus est Jesus ille*. To what end, says *Boys*, has he added *ille* which is not in the Original? This Style reigns thro' all his Version. For example in the 6. ver. of the same Chapter, he has it *David Rex ille*: And in *John* the 1. v. 1. we may read it three times, *In principio erat sermo ille*, & *sermo ille erat apud Deum*, *eratque ille sermo Deus*. When 'tis only once us'd in the Greek. And what is very well worth remarking, that in these places where this Pronoun is added, 'tis not only useles, but changes the sense. This is sufficient to advertise the Reader in general, to the end that he may make reflections when he meets with places of this nature. No man reading *Matt. 10. v. 3.* in *Beza's* Version, *Matthæus ille publicanus*, can imagine any otherwise than that *St. Matthew* was a very famous person amongst the *Publicans*, though indeed there is nothing in it.

What necessity, says *Boys*, had he to change the word *Generaciones* in the vulgar, *Matth. 1. v. 17.* to *progenies*? *Beza* himself owns that the Greek word γενεαι in this place, answers to the Hebrew תולדות which the best interpreters of the Old Testament have rendred *generaciones*: And no reason can be given for its change. Is this according to his promise in his Preface, that he would not swerve from the Ancient Latin Interpreter, without good reason?

But we should be oblig'd to transcribe all his Translation, if we would produce all the instances of his differing from the vulgar without any satisfactory reasons. Had not he better with that have rendred the 19th v. of the same Chapter by *traducere*, than *ignominia exponere*? He had better have put this last interpretation into his Notes.

The Ancient Interpreter has very well express'd the Greek word διακαλύπτω *Matt. 3. v. 14.* by *prohibebat*. But *Beza*, willing to refine it, has translated it *obnixe prohibebat*, as though the compound Verb διακαλύπτω signified any thing more in this place, than the simple verb καλύπτω. *Theophylact* who understood the sense of Greek words better than *Beza*, makes use of the simple verb καλύπτω in his explication of this passage, as *Boys* observes.

In the third verse of the same Chapter, and in several other places, he has chang'd *pœnitentiam agite*, (which is an ancient expression of the Western Churches) to *resipiscite*, he has also in several places used *resipiscencia* for *pœnitentia*. Now on this occasion we may object against him what he himself objected against *Castellio*, That without any necessity he had changed some words, which the usage of Divines had in a sort canonis'd amongst the Latins. He might have explain'd the proper signification of the Greek words μετανοειν and μετανοια in his Notes, and preferred the ancient expression of the Church in the Text of his Version.

The

The same might be said of several other expressions, which need not have been changed. For example, *Matt. 5. v. 29.* where the Vulgar, conformable to the Greek hath it *scandalizat te*, he alters it in his Version, to the Latin verb *offendere*, as if *scandalizare* were not sufficiently known. I do not deny that it is a Greek word Latiniz'd, and consequently Barbarous: But has not he retain'd several others not less barbarous than this? He himself has reproached *Castellio* for daring to change those words, which a long usage had authoris'd. *Boys* also says upon this place (a) that the verb *scandalizo*, being very well known amongst Christians, it argues too great a delicacy to use another in its place in a Translation of the Scripture. According to this Maxim, *Beza* was to blame to change the word *Synagoga* to *Conventus*. And 'tis somewhat strange, that having himself observed this fault in *Castellio*, he should not correct it in the later Editions of his New Testament.

John Boys has reason to blame *Beza*, for changing in *Matt. 25. 14, 15.* the words *secundum propriam virtutem*, in the Vulgar, to *secundum ipsius facultatem*, in his Version, when the Greek is *κατ' ιδίαν δ' ἑκάστην* (b) *Joann. Boys* wherefore, says this Learned Critick, should we be more cautious than the Holy Spirit? If the Holy Spirit made use of the word *propriam*, why should we shun it? This Argument is the stronger against *Beza*, because he had promised in the beginning of his Book to keep close to the Greek Text, and not to change the words into others, tho' Synonymous.

He moreover solidly refutes *Beza's* changing the words, *hic est sanguis meus*, as the Vulgar has it, *Matt. 26. 28.* to *hoc est sanguis meus*. This Calvinist, in his Note upon this place, call the Version of the ancient Interpreter (which was followed by *Erasmus*) a dangerous interpretation. He pretends that he ought rather have repeated the foregoing word *Calix*, that the demonstrative Pronoun may not refer to *Sanguis*: otherwise there would be no other subject designed than the Blood of CHRIST.

Thus *Beza* adjusts his Version to the opinions of his Party. He was afraid, that if he translated it according to the Vulgar, and *Erasmus*, *Hic*

(a) *Vetus scandalizat, verbo, hoc sensu, notissimo Christianis. Igitur loco suo moveri nolum, & si minus fortasse satisfecerit auribus delicatioribus quæ hujus loco ab aliis ponuntur interpretationibus sedem sibi querant in margine. Joann. Boys ad c. 5. Matt. v. 29.*

(b) *Cur enim cautiores simus magisve religiosi quam Spiritus Sanctus? Si Spiritus Sanctus non dubitavit dicere κατ' ιδίαν, cur nos vereamur dicere, secundum propriam? Id. ad c. 25. Matth. vers. 15.*

(c) *Vulgata & Erasmus hic periculosa interpretatione, cum potius repetenda fuerit calicis vox, nempe ne referatur demonstrativum pronomen ad αἷμα, id est, sanguinem. Nam alioqui nullum erit hujus propositionis subiectum præter ipsum sanguinem qui Christi esse dicatur. Bez. Not. in c. 26. Matth. vers. 28.*

est Sanguis meus, the Blood of JESUS CHRIST would be discovered in a place where he would only have Wine appear. But Boys has clearly proved him no good *Grammatician*, because that the Pronoun demonstrative ought to take place of the subject in a Proposition. He cites for example the words of *Lactantius*, who was sufficiently acquainted with the Latine Tongue; *Sola Catholica Ecclesia est quæ verum cultum retinet. Hic est Fons veritatis; hæc est domicilium Fidei; hoc Templum Dei.*

This Learned Canon charges *Beza* and *Piscator* with inconstancy in their Translations. He owns that they rendred the Greek word ἐκχυθήσθαι very well by *effunditur* in the Present Tense, and judiciously observed in their Notes, that the Present is in this place taken for the Future, and *effunditur* is put for *effundetur*, as 'tis in the Vulgar. He asks them why they abandoned this method in the place above, and why they did not always keep to the Grammatical sense. For example, in the 1st verse of the same Chapter, where it is in the Latin Edition *habetis*, in the Present tense, according to the Grammatical sense, they have put *habebitis* in the Future, in their Version. From whence came this inconstancy in translating, if not from their prejudices? Nevertheless if we believe *Beza*, he has retained a perfect uniformity in his Version.

We have more reason to ask him why he put in *primum Simonem*, *Matt.* 3. 16. when there is no Greek Exemplar that has *πρῶτον Σίμωνα* and these words are not in any ancient versions. Has he an allowance to make a Greek Text at his pleasure, that he may afterwards translate it according to his sentiments? 'Tis true, that he supports himself by *Erasmus's* Authority, who assures us to have read *πρῶτον Σίμωνα* in some Greek MSS. *Et hæc verba*, says he, *testatur Erasmus in nonnullis codicibus non extare, & ex Matthæo desumpta arbitratur. Ego vero non dubito quin hæc sit germana lectio.*

Erasmus in his Translation shun'd this reading, because he could find it but in very few Exemplars, and they such as he did not believe correct. I myself have seen a great number of Greek MSS. besides those mentioned in the *Oxford New Testament*; but I have not met with this Reading in any of them: Nay, 'tis not in the Ancient *Cambridge Copy*, where it should rather be than in any other. Boys who also blames *Beza's* Interpretation in this place, adds, That 'tis best to follow the Ancient Latin Interpreter, which agrees with the most and best Greek Manuscripts. *Simplicissimum ergo*, says he, *mibi videtur cum vetere Interprete optimorum exemplarium fidem sequi, & ni fallor numero majorum. Multa enim consului, nec dum videre licuit ubi scriptum esset πρῶτον Σίμωνα.*

We may make the same judgment of another addition which *Beza* has inserted into the first Editions of his Version, *Matt.* 1. 11. where he reads, *Josias autem genuit Jakim, Jakim autem genuit Jechoniam & Fratres ejus.* This reading we find in the Editions, 1565, and 1590. and in some others. In these Editions the Greek and Latin are both together, only separated by

by a line to divide the Columns, and in the Greek of that 1590. conformable to his Translation, he has put *ἰασίας ὃ ἐχύνει τ' ἰακίμ. ἰακίμ ὃ ἐχύνει τ' ἰεχορίαν, καὶ τὸς ἀδελφὲς αὐτῶν.*

This reading is contrary, not only to the Ancient Latin Interpreter, but to almost all the Greek MSS. We have proved elsewhere that it was rather a gloss that passed from the Margin to the Text, than a true reading. Tho' *Beza* has followed the ordinary Reading in his later Editions, yet he cannot forbear approving this in his Notes, tho' contrary to the greatest part of the Greek Exemplars, and all the Ancient Interpreters. He contents himself with reforming this, because 'twas found a manifest fault against the verity of History. He pretends that the true reading of this passage is: *ἰασίας ὃ ἐχύνει τ' ἰακίμ καὶ τὸς ἀδελφὲς αὐτῶν. ἰακίμ ὃ ἐχύνει τ' ἰεχορίαν ὅτι τ' μετοικεσίας βαβυλῶν.*

Job. Boys has Learnedly justified the ancient Latin Interpreters, rendering *καχετραμένη* *Luke 1. v. 28.* by *gratiâ plena*. He prefers this interpretation to that of *Beza*, and the other Modern Translators, who have affectedly swerv'd from it, as though it favour'd a superstitious worship. (d) The Blessed Virgin, says he, is said to be full of Grace, not for having more merit than other Women, but because she had received more of the Divine goodness. He judiciously observes that we ought not to change the version of the Churches interpreter, when it is true, under pretext of some abusing it, because the fault is not in the least in the interpreter. This spirit prevails throughout *Beza's* Translation, he having no regard to what he profess'd at the beginning of his work, which was to render the propriety of the Greek words exactly, and keep to the vulgar, except where it did not express the Greek well, or was very Barbarous.

Joann. Boys
ad c. 1.
Luc. v. 28.

The same *J. Boys* Judiciously and Learnedly defends the Author of the vulgar, in his translating *v. 78.* of the same Chap. the Greek word *ἀπαλὴ* by *Oriens*; where *Beza* renders it *is qui prodit*. If there is any obscurity in the Latin word *Oriens*, it might have been explained in the Notes.

He proves further that *Beza* was to blame for changing the Antient interpretation of *Luke 3. v. 1.* *procurante Pontio Pilato Judæam* to *Pontio Pilato Præside Judææ*; when the best Criticks of our age, agree that he ought to have distinguish'd between those that were *Presidents* of Syria, and those who were *Procurators*. *Certissimum est*, says the Canon of Ely, *Præsides Syriæ fuisse viros Consulares; Procuratores vero Judææ ex equestri ordine fuisse desumptos.*

Id. Boys ad
c. 3. *Luc.*
v. 1.

(d) *Gratia plena dicitur Virgo, non quod plus merita sit quam alie feminae, sed quod plus ex divina benignitate acceperit consecutaque fuerit.* *Joann. Boys ad c. 1. Luc. vers. 28.*

In the 5th of St. Luke v. 16. We ought to prefer this Version of the Antient Interpreter, *ipse autem secedebat in desertum*, to that of Beza, *ipse autem secedens erat in desertis*. This Genevian Translator enfeebles and changes the sense of the Original several times, by translating too Grammatically. This he is most guilty of, when he meets with Greek compounds, which he expresses in Latin by other compounds, and adding of words. And these words not being often used in the Greek in any other than a simple signification, 'Twould be impertinent to recount examples of this Nature.

Bez. Not.
in c. 7.
Luc. v. 47.

Beza Luke 7. v. 47. changes the Particle *quoniam* in the vulgar, and consonant to the Greek, into *nam*, for which he gives us this ridiculous reason. The vulgar and Erasmus, says he, have rendred *quoniam dilexit*: (e) but I rather choose to translate it *nam dilexit*, that it may appear more plainly that those words don't shew the cause of the remission of sins.

Thus this man accommodates the Scripture to his Calvinism, as if the particle *nam* were not a Causal particle. The Learned Boys, who observ'd this Error in Beza and Piscator, says that these two Translators endeavouring to shun the antient interpretation, which appear'd somewhat incommodious to them, according to their own principles are fallen into a more dangerous error, because 'tis certain that *nam* has more force of a causal particle than *quoniam*. Quia, says this learned Critick, *ut testantur diligentissimi Grammaticorum, quoniam, & particula id genus alie non tam causales sunt particule, quam subcontinuativa. At nam pure esse causalem sive rationis redditivam, etiam pueri norunt.*

The Oracle of Geneva thought he had gain'd a point against the Catholick Doctors, by accusing them of ignorance and impudence in his Notes on this place, because they cited it to shew that Justification comes not by Faith alone. But he much rather deserv'd the accusation, who did not know that *nam* is a causal particle. If he had had but an ordinary knowledge of the Hebrew Tongue, and the stile of the Septuagint, he would not have argu'd as he does, and rais'd a Controversie upon the Particles *nam* and *quoniam*. He might then have cast his eyes upon the particle ׀ amongst the Hebrews, which is express'd in that antient translation of the New Testament, by the causal particle ׀.

(e) Ego vero malui illo modo interpretari, ut facilius intelligatur in his verbis non ostendi causam remissionis peccatorum, sed ex consequente colligi antecedens. . . . Itaque qui hoc loco abutuntur ad evertendam gratuitam ex sola fide justificationem, non modo suam impudentiam, sed etiam infantiam summam patefaciunt. Bez. Not. in c. 7. Luc. v. 47.

He has not always in his Version hit the most natural sense of the Original, nor that which expresses the words thereof best, as *Luke 21. v. 4.* where we read in the vulgar *in munera Dei*, he has translated it *quæ donarent Deo*. But the Canon of *Eli* shews that he had no reason to swerve from the Ancient Latine Interpreter, and that *munera* is put in this place for *Gazophylacium*, which was the place where they put those things which were offer'd; which he confirms as well by *Drusus*, as the Syriac Version. *Beza* mentions this Interpretation in his Notes; but he does not always chuse the best, as 'tis easie to prove by several Examples.

To this Head may be reduc'd *Luke 24. v. 18.* where the Greek is *παροικῶν*, and the vulgar *peregrinus es*, he rather choseth to render it *com-moraris*: he also in his Notes charges the Latine Interpreter with varying from the ordinary signification of the word *παροικῶν*. But our Canon learnedly proves, That *παροικῶν* signifies *advena*, or *peregrinus sum*. And he confirms it by several Instances, (f) and by the Syriack Interpreter; and further intimates, That there was no reason for rendring this passage different from the Vulgar, because the following words explain the precedent.

*Joan. Boys
ad cap. 24.
Luc. v. 18.*

I can't see why *Beza* changes *John 1. 14.* those words so commonly known, and so well express'd in the Original, & *verbum caro factum est*, into those, *sermo ille factus est caro*.

For all he had promis'd at the beginning of his Work to preserve the Hebraïsmes wherewith the Style of the Apostle abounds, yet he cannot forbear swerving from them sometimes, and at the same time from the Vulgar. For Example, *John 3. v. 21.* instead of these words, *qui autem facit veritatem*, which render the Greek literally in our Edition, he has us'd *qui vero dat operam veritati*. I like the first Interpretation, says *Boys*, very well, because it conserves the Hebraïsmes.

He also charges *Beza* and *Piscator*, with unnecessarily changing *dedit alapam* in the Vulgar, *John 18. v. 12.* to *bacillo cecidit*. The first Interpretation is without doubt the best, says this Learned Protestant, unless any can pretend that *Nonnus* did not understand this place of St. *John*. *Prior interpretatio sine dubio præferenda, nisi si quis persuaderi sibi patiatur, Nonnum quid dixerit Joannes non intellexisse.*

*Joan. Boys
ad c. 18.
Joan. v. 12.*

In the 1st. of the *Acts*, v. 14. where the ancient Latine Interpreter has *cum mulieribus*, according to the Greek, *Beza* has rendred it *cum ux-
oribus*. And the reason he gives for this alteration is, That 'twas fit the Apostles Wives should be confirm'd in the Faith. *Conveniebat A-
postolorum etiam uxores confirmari.* As though 'twere permitted to a

*Bez. Not.
in c. 1. Act
v. 14.*

(f) Hunc sensum ut maxime genuinum secutus est Syrus etiam Interpres, nec cur ab eo recedendum sit idoneas aliquas video rationes. Porro, ut mihi videtur, quod sequitur exponit id quod antecedit. Παροικῶν, id est; ἐκ ἑτέρως *Joann. Boys ad c. 24. Luc. v. 18.*

Translator to alter the Text according to his Fancy, and to specific those things that are only generally hinted.

John Boys (g) prefers the Vulgar, because we may comprehend the Apostles Wives, under the general term of Women; and on the contrary Translating it *uxores*, lays a restriction upon it; and that the more general the word is, the more proper the Interpretation. He further says, That according to *Beza's* reason, *St. Luke* should have writ *σὺν γυναῖξιν αὐτῶν*, with their Wives.

Beza, in the first Edition of his Version, in *Acts* 2. 27. had put *cadaver meum*, where 'tis in the Vulgar *Animam meam*, conformable to the Greek. But *Castellio* having objected against him, That the word *ψυχή* does not signify *cadaver* amongst the Greeks; he has amended this place in his later Editions. By Translating *ψυχή* otherwise than *Anima*, says the Canon of *Eli*, he betray'd his Temerity. *Qui ψυχὴν μὲν aliter interpretantur quam animam meam, nihil aliud quam audaciam suam produnt.*

For all this *Beza* has defended his first Interpretation, in his answer to *Castellio*, where he assures us, (h) That he differed from the Ancient Version in this place, because the Roman Catholicks cite this passage of the *Acts* to establish their *Limbus*, and that the Ancient Fathers proved from it, That the Soul of JESUS CHRIST really descended to Hell. 'Tis thus that this Genevian Minister accommodates the Text to his prejudices; he might for the same reason, as *Castellio* objects, correct also *St. Luke*, because the Greek Word *ψυχή* signifies *anima*, and not *cadaver*. 'Tis a way of speaking the Hebrews and Arabians have, to use the word *anima* to distinguish the Person: And *Beza*, who professes to conserve the Hebraïsmes, had better have used *anima* with the Ancient Interpreter.

As for the Heterodox Opinions this word might produce, I answer, That according to his Principle, without examining the reasonableness of his Accusation of the Ancient Ecclesiastick Writers, he might find several Texts in the New Testament that would need his Correction, which is very absurd. When we meet with any Ambiguity, we may explain them by Notes; but when there are so many different Sects in the World, if every one should take the liberty to oblige all the obscure words to speak according to their Fancy, the Scriptures would no longer be the Word of God, but that of Men.

(g) Qui mulieres dicit, uxores etiam sub eadem appellatione comprehendere potest. At qui uxores nominat, solas illas nominat -- Igitur quo generalior, eo tutior erit & Græcis convenientior interpretatio. Joann. Boys ad cap. 1. Act. v. 14.

(h) Quod autem annotavi ex vetere Versione animam meam natum esse errorem, ac propterea me maluisse aliud nomen usurpare, non temere feci, cum hanc præcipue locum a Papistis torqueri ad suum Limbum constituendum videamus, & veteres etiam inde descensum illum animæ Christi ad inferos excogitarint. Bez. Respons. ad Castell. p. 96.

According to this Principle the Ancient Interpreter, and *Erasmus* after him, rendred in *Acts* 13. 34. the Greek Words very well, *ἡ διαφθορά*, by *in corruptionem*, because *διαφθορά* signifies in effect *corruptio*. But *Beza*, who rather consulted his Reason, than the Word it self in the Original, translates it *in sepulchrum*. His Reason is, because *St. Luke* follow'd the Septuagint, who express'd the Hebrew word *קבר* *sabat* by *διαφθορά*, and *sabat* signifies a Pit or Sepulchre.

He is not to be blam'd for having recourse to the Septuagint, to explain this place of *St. Luke*; but it were rather to be wish'd, that he had more frequently consulted the Ancient Interpreters. If his reasoning was true, wherefore has he rendred *διαφθορά* by *corruptionem* in the following verse? He can give no other reason for this different Translation, than that he had regard to the Sense, and not to the Word, which is the same with the former. If there was any difficulty in the Word, he ought not to put another in its place, in the Text of his Version, tho' he might have done it in the Notes to explain it.

Accordingly in these two places the word *corruptio* might be us'd, and at v. 34. it might be hinted in the Note, that it signified only *death*, and not *corruption*; as *Boys* observes on that passage of the *Acts*, where he judiciously and learnedly defends the Ancient Latine Interpreter. He has handled this passage the more prolixly, because, as he professes, (i) he thought it his duty so to do, he being to defend the Ancient Interpreter, and those that follow him in this place, amongst which he accounts the English Translators. Joan. Boys
ad c. Act.
13. v. 34.

This Learned Protestant also shews his Judgment and Erudition on *Acts* 14. v. 23. where it is *χειροτονήσαντες ὁ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους* in the Greek, and the Vulgar has it, & *cum constituissent illis Presbyteros*. But *Beza* renders it *cumque ipsi per suffragia creassent Presbyteros*; and observes in his Notes, (k) That the Greek Verb *χειροτοῦν*, imports also, that *St. Paul* and *Barnabas* did nothing without the suffrage of others, and that they exercis'd no Tyranny in the Church; in a word, That their practice was different from the present practice of the Bishops of the Church of Rome. Bez. Not.
in c. 14 Act.
v. 23.

(i) De hac re eo prolixius disserui, quia nequaquam putavi officii mei esse, postquam suscepi semel in me defensionem veteris Interpretis, ut aut illi, aut iis qui illum secuti sunt, quo in numero Anglici etiam Interpretes ponendi sunt, pro virili mea non deessent. Vel igitur retineo corruptionis vocabulum in hoc versu, vel pro eo interitum substituo. Joann. Boys ad c. 13. Act. v. 34.

(k) Est autem notanda vis huius verbi, ut Paulum ac Barnabam sciamus nihil privato arbitrio gessisse, nec ullam in Ecclesia exercuisse tyrannidem, nihil denique tale fecisse, quale hodie Romanus Papa & illius affecte quos Ordinarios vocant. Bez. Not. in c. 14. Act. v. 23.

Joann Boys
ad c. 14.
Act. v. 23.

This Observation, and several others of the same nature, wherewith his Notes on the New Testament are fill'd, are evident proofs of the prejudices he retain'd at the time of his Translating. *John Boys*, though a Protestant himself, would not allow that this Genevian Minister should abandon the Ancient Interpreter in this place. (1) Though, says he, I am not in the least for the Roman Hierarchy, yet I am perswaded that before these Controversies arose concerning the Discipline of the Church, there was no reasonable Man but would prefer the Vulgar in this place, or at least judge it allowable. He adds, That the English Translators follow'd it, and thought it the best.

Id. Ibid.

He further tells us, (m) That if we rather respect the usage of the Greek Word *χειροτονία* than the Syllables themselves, on which 'tis not always safe to rely, it signifies nothing more than to *establish*, to *create*, to *order*, to *design*, whether it be done with one suffrage, or with more, or with none at all. And that we may not rely on his Authority alone, he produces unquestionable Examples.

If I did not fear being too prolix, I could produce a greater number of Errors in *Beza's* Version of the New Testament: but I reserve some for the last part of this Work, where I shall examine his Notes, which were made partly to explain his Version. *Daniel Heinsius* has Learnedly and Judiciously reprehended this Interpreter in several places of his *Exercitationes Sacrae*. The Arminians and the Unitarians have also blam'd him for ill Translating several Passages of the New Testament, in favour of his prejudices; not to mention our own Controversitists who have found the same Fault with him; because the greatest part of them often wander from their Subject, and are ordinarily no great Critics.

In my Judgment we could not oppose a more Learned Man to *Theodore Beza*, than *John Boys* the English Canon; who, although a Protestant, lov'd Antiquity, and asserted nothing which he did not at the same time fortifie with strong Reasons: 'Twas no Caprice induc'd him to defend the Ancient Interpreter of the Church, but his persuasion that the Modern Translators had abandon'd him upon slight Reasons. He gave manifest proofs that he was exactly acquainted with the Subject whereof he treated, and understood the Greek and Latine much better than *Beza*:

(1) *Non faveo Romanae Hierarchiae; certe non faveo; sed tamen existimo ante exortam de disciplina Ecclesiastica controversiam neminem fuisse paulo equivoce cui Versio Vulgata, si minus praeferenda aliis, at saltem admodum tolerabilis hoc loco non videretur. Nostri Interpretes palmam illi tribuunt.* Joann. Boys ad c. 14. Act. v. 23.

(m) *Si usum loquendi, potius quam syllabas ipsas, quibus inherere saepe parum est tutum, respicias, nihil aliud declarat quam constituere, creare, ordinare, designare, sive id fiat per suffragium unum, sive per plura, sive absque suffragiis omnino. Exemplum passim occurrunt.* Id. ibid.

This Learned man was not only well skill'd in the Hebrew, but had also studied the style of the Writers of the New Testament in the Septuagint Version: a thing not very ordinary amongst the Protestants. Wherefore he learnedly observes, (n) that we can no way better understand the force of several expressions in the New Testament, than by consulting the Antient Greek Interpreters, for which the Evangelists and Apostles had so great an esteem, that they follow'd them exactly in their Citations. Id. ad c. 8.
Joann.
v. 25.

Tho' he was very moderate towards Beza, and treats him with a great deal of respect; yet he cannot forbear telling him that he rather appear'd a Scholar than a Master, in the Original Greek words, and that he was ignorant of the sense of some Latin ones. In a word, The Canon of Ely was a learn'd Critique, and did not content himself with reading the Prophane Greek Authors; but apply'd himself to the study of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: And Beza was better read in the Poets than the Holy Authors.

'Tis this that makes him mistake several times, when he would correct the style of the Scripture. For instance Acts 11. v. 17. where 'tis in Greek ἐγὼ τίς ἤμιν δύνάτω, he tells us that it might be better read ἐμὶ, than ἡμιν, because ἡμιν is absolutely Poetick. *Fortasse rectius legitur ἐμὶ sum, nam illud ἡμιν penitus poeticum est.* Bez. Not.
in c. 11.
Act. v. 17.

But the Learn'd Boys (o) evinces by clear examples that this expression is not so poetick, but that 'tis the same dialect which the Seventy us'd in their Translation. Thus much for Beza and his Version. We shall find a time to speak of Piscator: but I believe 'twill be more to the purpose in the last Part of this Work, where I shall examine his Notes. Joann.
Boys ad
c. 11.
Act. v. 17.

(n) Unde autem melius discamus quæ sit vis multarum dictionum & locutionum in Novo Testamento, quam ex Interpretibus illis, quos constat tanto fuisse in pretio apud Apostolos & Evangelistas, ut in testimoniis ex vetere foderè citandis ne latum quidem unguem ab illorum verbis & vestigiis discesserint. Id. Boys ad c. 8. Joann. v. 25.

(o) Ait Beza τὸ ἡμιν penitus esse poeticum. Sed pace tanti viri dixerim, non sic est poeticum, ut non sit ejus etiam dialecti quæ usi sunt Græci Bibliorum Interpretes. Quoties enim apud illos occurrit ἡμιν pro ἡν, id est, eram. Joann. Boys ad c. 11. Act. v. 17.

CHAP. XXVII.

Of the Translations of the New Testament into vulgar Languages, and first of those in French. Of the Version of the Gospels in the Antient Language of the French, which was the Teutonick.

THough there was no Antient Version of the Scripture, which was not, to speak properly, in the vulgar Language, that is to say in a Language understood by those people for whom it was translated. Yet the words *Vulgar* and *Language*, joyn'd, seem now to have quite another sense: or rather at present, difficulties are form'd concerning the Translations of the Bible into vulgar Languages, which were unknown to all Antiquity.

This obliges me to distinguish the Translation into vulgar Languages, from those which the people don't understand. For instance, the Latin is the common Language, and vulgar, to the Nations for which the Bible was rendred into Latin. The same may be said of the Syriack, Coptick, Æthiopian and Armenian Tongues. All the people spoke those Antient Languages, at that time when their Versions were made. We may also call the Arabick Version, which the *Syrians* or *Copticks* read at this day, Translations into vulgar Languages, because the people now cannot understand Syriack and Coptick.

Nevertheless to confine my self to *Europe* only, which has given birth to several Controversies concerning Translations into the vulgar Tongues: I comprehend under this title only, the Translations made in the West, for the particular instruction of the people, since the disuse of the Latin. 'Tis certain that there has been a great number of Translations in all Languages, published since then: so that if we would decide this question concerning Translations into vulgar Languages (which is bandied with so much heat) by the History of Past Times, without doubt they would be permitted to the people: because the usage of all Nations as to this was uniform.

But as 'tis purely a point of discipline, this usage has not the force of a Law, because the reasons thereof change. For this reason an excellent University has absolutely condemn'd these Versions, because of the disorders they made in Church and State. This condemnation is only provisional, and cannot be made a general and absolute Rule for all sort of times. It pertains to the Bishops to judge whether it be fit to permit or restrain them in their Dioceses, by reason they are in this case the Masters of Ecclesiastical Discipline. Wherefore 'tis not strange to see different customs in this Subject, in different Realms, nay in different Dioceses.

Dioceses of the same Realm. I suppose that the Bishops in this case regard nothing but the peace of the Church, and the good of the People committed to their care.

We find but two sorts of People who vigorously defend the indifferent permission of the Bible in Vulgar Languages, to the whole World at all times, and they are either Protestants, or the Authors of New Translations: As for the first, we know for what Reasons they embrace this Opinion; and the later are often induc'd by Interest to vindicate it, because they think themselves oblig'd to defend their own productions, although they plunge themselves into several difficulties thereby. But this is no place to examine their Reasons, my design being only to give an historical Account of their Translations.

'Tis more than eight hundred Years since the *French* Translated the Gospels into their Ancient Language, which was then the *Teutonic*. This Version, which was made in the Reign of *Lewis the Debonair*, and publish'd at *Basil*, 1571. by *Flacius Illyricus*, was in Verse, and is rather the harmony or agreement of the Four Gospels, than the Gospels themselves. *Otfride*, the Benedictine Monk, who was the Author thereof, and Scholar to the Famous *Rabanus Maurus*, addresses himself to his Bishop in this Inscription: *Dignitatis culmine gratia divina praelato Luitberti Moguntiacensis urbis Archiepiscopo, Otfridus quamvis indignus, tamen devotione Monachus Presbyterque exiguis aeternae vitae gaudium optat.* Otfrid. Epist. ad Luitber. Arch. Mog.

This Monk, in his preliminary Epistle, tells us the Reasons which engag'd him to publish a Poetical Abridgment of the Gospels in his Native Language. Several vertuous Persons, who could ill bear those immodest Songs then dispers'd amongst the People, oblig'd him to this Undertaking: He was solicited thereto by several of his Brethren (and especially by a Lady of Quality, who was call'd *Judith*) that he might by that means rid the Peoples hands of those prophane Poems. (a) 'Twas at their request, says this wise Monk, that I Translated part of the Gospels into *French*, intermixing Spiritual and Moral things, to the end, that those who dislike'd them in a Language whereof they were ignorant, might study the Law of God in their own Tongue, and be afraid of swerving from it. Id. ibid.

(a) Scripsi namque eorum precum suffultus juvamine Evangeliorum partem franciscè compositam, interdum spiritualia moraliaque verba permiscens, ut qui in illis aliene lingua difficultatem horrescit, hic propria lingua cognoscat sanctissima verba, Dominique legem sua lingua intelligens, inde se vel parum quid deviare mente pertimescat. Otfrid. Epist. ad Luitb. Arch. Mogunt.

Ibid.

He tells us also, in the same place, the Method which he follow'd; (b) I took, says he, something out of every Gospel to compose my Work, which I have divided into Five Books, whereof the first contains the Birth of *Jesus Christ*, &c.

Trithemius, (c) who praises *Otfride* for a Man well skill'd in the Holy Scriptures and Humane Learning, says, That in this he follow'd *Charlemaine*, having by his Example endeavour'd to reduce the Teutonick Language to Grammar Rules; and that the Books he wrote in that Tongue, can hardly be understood now, by those that are best acquainted with the German.

It seems this *Otfride* was the first that attempted the reduction of the Ancient Teutonick Tongue to Rules, which, as he professes, was very difficult; for such was its barbarity, that it would not submit to the Laws of Grammar. *Incultam & indisciplinabilem atque insuetam capi regulari freno Grammaticæ artis.*

Flac. Illyr. Ep. que premittit libr. Otfri.

Illyricus, who publish'd this Book, calls it an excellent Treasure of Teutonick, or *Almain* Antiquity. *Thesaurum egregium Antiquitatis Teutonum.* In his Epistle before it, he cites some places of *Beatus Rhenanus's* History of *Germany*, to shew that the Teutonick was the Language of the Ancient *French*, that was establish'd amongst the *Gauls*, after their passing the *Rhine*, which the said *Rhenanus* proves, by this Book of *Otfride*, which he had seen in Manuscript in a Library at *Frisingben*.

B. Rhen. de reb. Germ. apud Flac. Illyr.

He tells us besides, (d) That he had seen a Psalter in the same Language at *Strasbourg*: The Ancient *French*, says he, were highly to be commended for their Translating the Sacred Books into their Language, which then was the *German*: though we know indeed that some of our Divines have condemn'd that practice. *Illyricus* also, in the

(b) Scripsi itaque in primis & in ultimis hujus libri partibus inter quatuor Evangelistas incedens medius, ut modo quid iste, quidve alius caterique scriberent inter illos ordinatim prout potui pene distavi --- Volumen namque illud in quinque libros distinxi, quorum primus natiuitatem Christi memorat, &c. Id. ibid.

(c) *Otfridus* Monachus *Wissenburgensis* Cœnobii - - vir in diuinis scripturis eruditissimus, & in secularibus literis egregie doctus, Philosophus, Rhetor & Poeta insignis, ingenio excellens, & discretus eloquio, scripsit tam metro quam prosa multa præclara opuscula, quibus nomen suum ad posterum transmisit, exemplo etiam *Caroli Imperatoris Magni* conatus est barbariem Lingue Theutonice ad regulas Grammaticales reducere. Quod & ex parte perfecit. Unde ea quæ patrio sermone conscripsit, non facile nostra ætate legi & intelligi possunt, etiam ab homine quantumcunque Theutonice lingue perito. Joann. Trith. lib. de Script. Eccles. ad voc. *Otfrid*.

(d) Hujus generis Psalterium vidimus apud Joannem Huttichium nostrum Argentorati. Perpetuo vero laus Francorum veterum qui sacros libros in suam, hoc est Germanicum linguam vertendos curauerint. Quod nuper a Theologis quibusdam improbatum scimus. B. Rhen. de reb. Germ. apud Flac. Illyr.

place above cited, makes use of this Example of *Otfride*, (e) to prove, *Id. ibid.*
 that the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue was allowed the People under
Charlemaine, and *Lewis the Debonair*, when the Bishops were (accord-
 ing to him) more Learned than in his time. He adds, *Otfride* him-
 self Dedicated his Version of the Gospels in the Teutonic Language,
 to his Archbishop, to have only his approbation, without submitting
 it to the Pope, and the Roman Church, as 'twas customary afterwards.
Hoc opus tantum suo Archiepiscopo examinandum & probandum commendat,
non id Pontificum Beatorum pedibus & Romana Ecclesie subjicit, sicut po-
stea fieri necesse fuit. He pretends also, That (f) *Strabo*, *Rabanus*, and
Haimo, Translated the Bible into the Vulgar Languages under *Charle-*
maine, and that their Versions are lost. *Ibid.*

'Tis thus that this Protestant would justify their Conduct, who in-
 differently allow all Persons to read the Holy Scripture. But granting
 that the best Catholick Doctors agree to this ancient practice of the
 Church, yet his instance is not very favourable to his design; for *Otfride*
 only extracted the Life of JESUS CHRIST out of the Four Gos-
 pels, in Verse, adding some Moralities for the Instruction of the People,
 which is far different from an intire Translation of the Bible.

He had need be indued with the Spirit of a Controvertist, to object
 against the Catholicks, that they are oblig'd to submit their Versions to
 the Authority of the Popes; this needs no refutation. And further,
 when it shall prove true, That the three Learned Men he mentions,
 Translated the Bible into Vulgar Languages under *Charlemaine*; 'twill
 not conclude any thing advantagious to his Party against some Catho-
 lick Divines, who in these later times have oppos'd the Translations of
 the Scripture into Vulgar Languages. We do not deny the use of these
 Versions to be very Ancient, but judge it fit to retrench them, at least
 for some time, and with respect to some Persons.

The Fanaticisme which the Protestants have introduc'd into Europe
 by their Versions into the Vulgar Tongue, and our experience of the
 great disorders in Religion and State, the reading of them has caus'd,

(e) Cum nunc acriter controvertatur an liceat sacras literas a multitudine, idque præfer-
 tim vulgaribus quarumvis gentium linguis, legi, hic habemus illustrem questionis istius deci-
 sionem. Quod olim tempore Christianissimorum Cesarum Caroli Magni & Ludovici Pii, cum
 Episcopi adhuc essent literatiores, & Ecclesie Religioque nonnihil magis florent, quam postea
 quando hoc opus compositum publicatumque est, non tantum fas piunque habitum vulgi manu sa-
 cras literas veri, sed etiam vulgaribus rythmis vulgo passim decantari & celebrari. Illyr. Ep.
 in Evang. Theut.

(f) Tempore Caroli Magni tres doctos viros, Strabonem, Rabanum & Haimonem, idem
 sacrum volumen in vulgarem linguam convertisse leguntur. Quorum tamen opus tam cito inte-
 risse valde dolendum est. Id. ibid.

gave occasion for these Regulations, which ought to be consider'd as only provisional. 'Tis for this reason that we do not allow the publication of New Translations in Vulgar Languages, notwithstanding the defence is made for them. 'Tis also worth observing, That the Ancient Authors of Vulgar Versions, suppos'd that all read the Bible in Latine in their Churches, which was not understood by the Laity, and manifestly condemn'd the practice of all the Protestants.

C H A P. XXVIII.

Of the first French Translations, and chiefly of that of Guiars de Moulins, whereof there are several MSS. Copies in the King's Library. Of that which is attributed to Nicholas Oresme.

THE Subject of Translations into Vulgar Languages for the use of the People submitted to the Church of Rome, being very briefly handled in the Critical History of the Old Testament, 'twill not be amiss to treat thereof more largely in this place. I shall chiefly confine my self to those compos'd by French Men, that I may shew the custom of our Ancestors in reading the Holy Scripture: Though 'tis not necessary that their Example should pass into a Rule; for as I observ'd before, a Custom, tho' authoris'd by long use, has not the force of a Law, when there are good reasons to change it.

I should here speak of the Bibles of the *Vandois*, if I had any MSS. Copies. But Pope *Innocent* the Third, strenuously endeavour'd to abolish the French Versions dispers'd in his time in the Diocese of Metz, because they gave occasion to Conventicles, and the establishing Novelities. Whilst the People were obedient to their Bishops, and regarded their Instructions, they were not forbid the reading of the Bible in their own Language; and 'twas only the abuse of their Liberty that caus'd these prohibitions.

I have found nothing more Ancient, that looks like a Translation of the Scripture in our Language, than the Version of *Guiars de Moulins*; Canon of St. Peter's of *Aire*, which he compos'd at the end of the 13th. Century. There are a great many MSS. Exemplars of this in the King's Library, and the Language of each of them is very different from the other, because the Copists alter'd it according to the times and places, when, and where they were transcrib'd. This Version was only a Translation of *Peter Comestor's* Book into French, as appears by the Preface, whereof I shall Transcribe enough to shew the Translator's design.

In one of the MSS. in the King's Library, mark'd 6819. this Preface begins thus. *Because the Devil every day molests, disturbs, and pollutes the Heart of Men, by Idleness, and a thousand Snares which he lays to entrap our Hearts, never ceasing his endeavours to entice us to Sin, that he may thereby draw us into Hell with him, 'tis the business of our Clergy, and Priests of Holy Church, after their Orisons, to employ themselves in doing some good work.*

After having spoken of the Devil's Tempting Men, he adds. "And because the Devil has many times drawn me into Sin, by Idleness, that he may no more find me unemploy'd in good Works, I, that am Priest and Canon of St. Peter's of Aire, in the Bishoprick of Thero-venne, by name *Guier de Moulins*, called first of all to the Praise of God, the Virgin Mary, and of all the Saints, and next, to the profit of all them this Book shall reach; wherein (at the request of a special Friend, who much desired the profit of my Soul) I have Translated the Historical Books of the Bible from the Latine, in the method which the School-men use in their Histories, yet omitting their Histories, my business not being to Translate them, and taking only the plain Text of the Historical Books of the Bible. I desire all that shall read these Translations, if they find any Fault therein, to take for excuse what I here protest, *viz.* That I have not taken, nor added any thing besides the pure Verity, as I have found it in the Latine Bible, and the Scholastical Histories; and those that will search may see, That I have followed the pure Verity in these Translations, word for word, as I found it in the Latine. I began these Translations in the Year of Grace 1291. and finish'd them in the Year 1294. in the Month of February.

After this he places a Catalogue of the Books of the Bible, professing to follow absolutely the order of *Petrus Comestor*, which he calls Master in History. He adds, in form of a Title, *Cest livres est apele la Bible historians ou histoire li Escolatre.* The first Verse of *Genesis* is thus express'd, *Au commencement cria Diex le ciel & la terre la terre étoit vaine & vuide & tenebres étoient sus la face d'abisme & li esperis nostre seigneur estoit portes seur les yaues.*

The same Words are somewhat differently express'd in another MS. in the King's Library, which diversity proceeds only from the different Pronunciations of the French Language in several Provinces. In the MSS. N. 6818. 'tis read thus. *Chi commencent les livres de le bible hyistoriaux translate en franchois selon le latin premierement le livre de Genesis — au commencement crea Diex le chiel & le terre. Le terre estoit vaine & vuide & tenebres estoient sour le fache d'abisme & li esperis de nostre seigneur estoit porte sour les eunes.* This Language approaches very nigh that of the Picards.

MS. de la
Bib. du Roy,
6818.

The different Languages which we find in several Copies of the same French Bible, inform us, that these sorts of Translations heretofore were common in France. I have seen a Copy in the King's Library, which belong'd to one of the Dukes of Berri, as appears by this beginning. This is the Historical Bible, which appertains to John, Son to the King of France, Duke of Berri and Auvergne, Count of Poitou Estampes, Bouligne, and Auvergne.

Besides the Translator's Preface, which we have cited above, this Exemplar has another by Comestor, in French, at the beginning whereof, 'tis thus entitled. *C'est une lettre que li maistres mist en hyistoires qui Pierre Prestre ou doyens de *Treyes ot nom envoya au commencement de son ouvrage a l'Arcevesque de Sens pour son ouvrage corrigier se mestier en eust.* By which it appears, that Guiars de Moulins only translated Comestor into French, and not the whole Bible: Besides what we have above-cited of this Author's Preface, we may read in the Duke of Berri's Exemplar these words: *Vrayement de la verité ne suis je de rien yssus ne nouveleté ay adjouste ains ai pour lui cest saint maistre en hyistoires en toutes les choses qui en Romans doivent estre pour raison translatees si pri a tous Clerks entendant escriptures qui cest ouvrage liront que sils y trouvent a corrigier que la lime de leur sens vueille limer mon rude engin & corrigier.*

MS. de la
Bibl. du
Roy n.
5828.

We also find another MS. of the same Translation in the abovesaid Library, which belong'd to Charles of Gonzague and Cleves, Dukes of Nevers and Retelois. I could mention many others which I have seen, and which are so many proofs, that heretofore the Persons best qualified read the Bible in French. The finest of all these MSS. is a Latine and French Exemplar, wherein every Page is divided into four Columns, whereof two of them are written, and the other two contain the Figures, or Representations of those things mentioned in the Writing: the Writing is in the first and third Column, and the Figures and Images in the second and fourth: Every Column comprehends four Figures, and consequently there are eight in every Page of the Book. There are so many small divisions, as well in Latine as in French, as answer to Comestor's Glosses, and the Figures: And at the beginning of this fine Manuscript, we find these Words: *This Historical Bible in Latine and French, appertain'd to the good Duke Philip of Bourgoync, the Twelfth of that Name, and at present belongs to his Nephew, the Son of his Sister.*

There was nothing in these times more esteem'd, nor oftner taken for the Holy Scripture, than Petrus Comestor, he was Translated into several European Tongues. They read the Bible no otherwise than it was in this Author and his Glosses. This usage continued a long time in France. For besides the Edition I mention'd in Chap. 2. of this History, there was a French Version of the whole Bible, Printed at Paris 1545. by Angeliers, which is nothing else than Comestor Translated by Guiars de Moulins revised. The Translator not understanding Guiars's Language, has

has alter'd the sense in several places, as appears by the first words of the Bible, where instead of these words, *Li esperits de nostre seigneur estoit porté*, he has put *Les esperits de nostre seigneur estoient portés*, not observing that the ancient French writ several Nouns singular, with the Letter *s* at the end. 'T would be insignificant to run through the Traductions which have been made, and after revis'd by Persons very little acquainted with the Latin Tongue, and the Style of the Scripture.

As the Old Testament was not entire in *Comestor's* Epitome, so he had only a Harmony, or agreement of the Gospels, which Moulins Translated, and was thus intituled, *Chi commencent les Evangelles en le maniere que li maîtres en traite en hystoires*. He adds afterwards. *The MS. de la Bibl. du Roy. n. 6812.* Masters in History observing that the four Evangelists spoke but the same things in different words, thought it is not fit to put them in the same order they lie in the Bible. Wherefore he begins his Harmony with those words of St. Luke, *Il fu es jours Herode de Judée Roys un Prestres qui Zacaries ot non de le lignie & de le semenche Abie qui eut une femme de le lignie Aaron*. Another exemplar begins with the first words of St. Luke. *Pourceque moult se sont efforcés de raconter les choses qui en sont accomplies*, &c.

The Acts of the Apostles are plac'd next after this Harmony of the Gospels, with this Title, *Da fait des Apostles*; they begin thus: *O tu Theophilus jai parlei des choses que Jhs commencha a faire en son tans*. St. Paul's Epistles supply the third place in our Edition, and he thus renders the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans, *Pol serf Jhu xps. apeles Apostres departi en l'Evangile de Dieu de son fils quil avoit promis devant par les Prophetes en la sainte escripture qui fut nes de la semenche David selon la char*. This Exemplar was writ in 1347. as appears by these words at the end of the Epistle to the Hebrews: *Escrites furent ces epistres l'an MCCCXLVII. ou mois daust pries pour celui qui les fist escrire & pour le Clerc qui les escriit*. We may see the same thing at the end of the Epistle of St. Jude, which is the last of the Canonical Epistles, which begins with St. James.

In the King's Library there is a Manuscript of the New Testament in French, where the Gospels are entire, with the Glosses joyn'd to the Text. It begins with the following Title written in red: *Ci commence l'Evangile M.S. Matthieu*; and the Book begins thus, *ce livre de la generation Jhu Christ fils David fils Abraham*. The Epistle of St. Paul follows next after the Gospels thus entituled: *Ci commencent les epistres de Monsieur S. Paul*: The Epistle to the Romans begins thus: *Pol serf de Jesu Crist apele Apostre departi en levangile de son fils*, &c. The Acts of the Apostles are also entituled, *le fait des Apostres*. This Copy was writ at Pavia for K. Lewis the XII. *MS. in the K's Library, n. 6830.*

Amongst the great number of the King's Manuscripts, I have not found any Copy attributed to Nicholas Oresme, who is ordinarily reputed the Translator of an intire Translation of the Holy Scripture, in the

Marol.
Pref. de
sa Vers. de
N. Y.

Du Till.
Chron.
abreg. des
Rois de
France, tit.
Charl. le
Quint.

Def. des
vers. de
l'Ecrit. S.
P 58.

Chap. 2.

the Reign of *Charles the V.* Nevertheless *Monsieur Marolles* assures us, That there are some *Exemplars* thereof, in the King's Library. *Tillet* speaking of *Oresme* says, That he was a Learned Man, and that he Translated several pieces of *Aristotle*, *Cicero*, and other Authors: And after having observ'd that *Charles the V.* voluntarily follow'd his Advice, he adds, That the said *Charles the V.* being a great lover of Learning, and Learned Men. During his Reign, he was very careful of Ecclesiastical things, and Holy Learning, and very desirous that the Bible should be diligently and truly Translated, because the *Vaudois* perverted it according to their pleasure.

The Gentlemen of the Port Royal, have also cited this Version of *Oresme* on the reputation of other Authors, without having ever seen it. There appear'd in the World, a Book intituled, *A Defence of the Versions of the Holy Scripture*, which is attributed to *Monsieur Arnould*, where he proves by the Example of the same *Oresme*, that the Divines of *Paris* did not always reject the Version of the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue. It appears (says he) that they were not always of this Opinion, for *Nicholas Oresme*, a Doctor of *Paris*, of the House of *Navarre*, who died 1377. being chosen by King *John*, for a Tutor to his Son, afterwards *Charles the V.* call'd, The Wise, Translated the whole Bible into French, at the Request of that King.

But certainly he might have done better than to attribute to this Prince what was done under *Charles the VIII.* who, as I observ'd before, caus'd a new Edition of *Guiars des Moulins* Version to be published. 'Tis not very probable if *Oresme* had Translated the Bible a-new into French, that *Moulins* Version should be publish'd in *Charles the VIII.*'s time. That which makes me conjecture that it fell out thus, is, that in the King's Exemplar Printed upon fine Parchment, at the beginning of the Book, there is a Canon in his Surplice, with his Fur on his Arm, presenting a Bible to *Charles the VIII.*

Oresme being Canon of the Holy Chappel, and Dean of *Roven*, before he was Bishop of *Liseux*. Those that have seen this Bible in the King's Library, have perhaps attributed to *Charles the V.* and *Oresme*, what was done only under *Charles the VIII.* who was an Admirer of Versions in the Vulgar Languages, as appears by the Preface to the Psalter Translated into French in his time, whereof we produc'd an Extract in Chap. 2. of this work. 'Tis there expressly observ'd, that this Prince imitated the Examples of *Charlemagne* and *St. Lewis*. *Charles the V.* not being so much as mention'd.

Further after having examin'd the Effigies of the Canon which is at the beginning of the Edition publish'd under *Charles the VIII.* I find it to be *Guiars de Moulins*, who was a Canon, and his Effigies they place before the Book, whereof he was Author. We need not enquire after any other Canon than he, as he informs us by his own words at the end of his Prologue, *I began this Translation* (says he) *in the Year of Grace*

1291. in the Month of June, wherein I was born, and was then 40 Years old, I finish'd it in the Year 1297. on St. Remi's Day, it being the day whereon I was made Dean of St. Peters of Aire, whereof I was Canon.

There is also at the beginning of this Edition, the Effigies of Peter Comestor, in the habit of a Doctor with his Fur, as also his Cap on his Head, and an open Book before him. This Figure is plac'd before the Prologue on Genesis, which is thus entitled, *The Master of History's prologue. Of the Creation of the Imperial Heaven, and all the Elements*: He begins it with this fine Series of Impertinencies. *In a King or Emperour's Palace, there are commonly three Mansions, namely, an Auditory where Judgments are pass'd, and Justice distributed to all. Chambers wherein he Reposes himself. And his Hall where he eats. In like manner our Emperour, who commands the Winds and Seas, has the World for his Auditory, wherein all things are done at his Command, and according to his Will. Whereof it is written, Cœlum & Terram ego implebo. I will fill the Heaven and Earth. And accordingly he is call'd Lord, of whom 'tis written, Domini est Terra.*

'Tis strange that these Impertinencies of *Petrus Comestor* Translated by *Guiars de Moulins*, should be publish'd in the French Edition of the Bible 1545. whereof we have spoken. In this Edition they only alter'd some things in the Prefaces, Texts, and Glosses of the Version, by reason of the change of the French Language. These Editions differ most from the Manuscripts, in this, That they have the New Testament intire.

But to return to *Nicholas Oresme's* Version, *Benedict Turretin* speaks, as though he had seen it, and cites thence the Lord's Prayer in these words: *Sire donne nous huy nostre pain de chacun jour & nous pardonne nos pechies aussi comme nous pardonnons a ceux qui nous mesfont & ne nous mene mie en temptation c'est a dire ne souffre mie que nous soyons temptes mais delivre nous du mal amen. Amen vaut autant en cet endroit comme ce soit fait.*

*Benedict.
Turret.
Defens. des
Trad. de la
Bibl. de
Gen.*

This is sufficient to perswade me, that *Oresme* never Translated the Bible, because that the Lord's Prayer is the same in *Guiars de Moulins* Version, publish'd under *Charles* the VIII. because the Publisher of this Edition Dedicates it to a certain King *Charles*, and makes it to be presented to him by a Canon; *Turretin* imagines, that it could be no other than *Nicholas Oresme* Canon of the Holy Chappel, who lived under *Charles* the V. although *Charles* the VIII. be nam'd in the Preliminary Epistle.

Nevertheless *Turretin* distinguishes these two Versions. The Lord's Prayer, according to him, is thus express'd in that of *Guiars de Moulins*. *Donne nous chacun jour nostre pain que tu nous as acoustumé a donner tous les jours & nous pardonne nos pechies si comme nous pardonnons a ceux qui nous mesfont. Et ne nous mene mie en temptation.* But this difference proceeds only from the frequent Transcribing and Correcting this Version at several

ral times, and in several places. These Transcribers took very much liberty, but especially in the Glosses, sometimes adding, and sometimes diminishing. I know no reason why *Turretine*, who had seen *Moulins* Version in the *Geneva* Library, should call him *Girard de Moulins*. The Name *Girard* is in no MSS. that I have seen. But I have said enough of these Versions which are of no use. 'Twill serve to satisfy the Curiosity of the *French*, and to shew that the Bible was read in *France* in our own Language, long before the Origine of the *Protestants*.

C H A P. XXIX.

Of several other French Versions of the Holy Scripture, and chiefly of that Printed at Antwerp in 1530. which gave occasion for the Translation of all the rest. The first Editions of the Translation Published by those of Geneva. Of Sebastian Castellio's French New Testament.

Book 2.
Chap. 22.

I Have not seen any Version Printed at *Lyons* in 1521. though it be cited by several Authors. The first Edition of the whole Bible in *French*, wherein there appears any exactness, is that of *Antwerp* 1530. by *Martin Lempereur*, with the privilege of *Charles* the V. 'Twas Reprinted at the same place in 1534. and in 1541. The Reader may see our Observations upon this Version, in the Critical History of the Old Testament, as it was review'd by the Divines of *Louvain*, for we there place the first *French* Bible at *Louvain*, in the Year 1530.

I know Father *Veron*, and other Writers, have reproach'd the Divines of *Louvain*, for doing nothing else but purging the Ancient Version of *Geneva*, in their Edition 1557. And that that which we call the *Louvain* Bible, is that of *Geneva* review'd in some places by the Divines of that University. Indeed if we compare these two Versions, we shall find them so like, that it cannot be denied, but that the one was taken out of the other. For this reason Father *Veron* says, That they have retain'd a good part of the Faults of the *Geneva* Bible in their Edition. *Il n'ont pu, (says he) d'une premiere eau ou ballay & revision la nettoyer ou vers. Fr. du N. Test.*

I firmly believe that the *Louvain* Divines Copied the *Geneva* Version in many places. But this Father passes by in silence, that the first *Geneva* Bible in 1535. was Copied from that of *Antwerp* 1530. which was review'd by the Divines of *Louvain*. And thus we see the first Publishers of the *French* Bibles, which we now read, were the *Catholicks*. *Robert Olivetan*

Oliverian who caused the first *Geneva Bible* to be Printed at *Neufchâtel*, which he assures us to have rendred from the Hebrew and Greek, to speak properly, did nothing else but review, or rather alter the *Antwerp Version* in some places.

The Publishers of the *Antwerp French Bible* did not follow exactly the Ancient *Latin* Interpreter, nor sometimes did they consult the Originals, which might enable them to know the best readings of the *Latin* Copies, or to limit the sense of the Ancient Interpreter. For Example, *Romans* ch. 1. v. 4. they, according to *Erasmus*, have render'd it, *Qui est déclaré fils de Dieu*; instead of the *Vulgar*, *Qui prædestinatus est Filius Dei*. 'Tis apparent they thought the word *prædestiné* might give occasion to a false sense in this place, as though 'twere the same *Prædestination* which is handled in the Schools.

They have also follow'd *Erasmus* in *John*, ch. 1. v. 1. rendering it, *Au commencement étoit la Parole, & la Parole étoit avec Dieu*. They did not use the word *Verbe*, which is in the *Vulgar*. Nevertheless they differ from him in several places, where he differs from the *Vulgar*, as in *Acts* ch. 13. v. 2. where they, according to our *Latin* Edition, render it *iceux ministrans au Seigneur*, and not according to *Erasmus*, *Sacrisans*.

And in *John* 8. v. 25. they have translated these words, *Principium qui & loquor vobis*, by these *je suis le commencement qui parle à vous*, although they knew the Original had another sense, which they are content to place in the Margin in form of a Note thus: *Je suis ce que vous ay dit dès le commencement en parlant à vous*.

We may observe that there are two sorts of Notes in the Margin of this ancient *French Translation* printed at *Antwerp*. The one explaining some words of the Text; the other containing the variety of Interpretations, which are ordinarily made of the Greek of the New, and Hebrew of the Old Testament. Thus *Mark* 1. v. 2. they, according to the *Vulgar*, render it, *ainsi qu'il est écrit en Esaje le Prophete*; and put *es Prophetes* in the Margin, as 'tis in the ordinary Greek. Also in *Matt.* 6. v. 13. we see these words, *Car à toy est le regne & la puissance à toujours*; according to the ordinary Greek opposite to *du malin*.

Their Notes being short and few, are commonly literal, and sometimes critical, as on the 1st. of *St. Matthew*, v. 11. They have this Observation on the word *Jechonias*. That here, according to the Hebrews, *Joachim & Joachin engendra*, is inserted. In Chap. 2. of the same Gospel, and v. 11. where they have rendred these words of the vulgar, *Proidentes adoraverunt eum*, by these, *en se prosternant & adorèrent*, they have added in the Margin, *The Hebrews often use the word adore*, for to honour with Prostration of Body, as was customary to the Eastern Kings and Princes.

In a word, there is nothing but what is good sense in the *Antwerp French Bible*. We may judge by what has been cited, that the Translators applied themselves to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and the Editions before were very mean. I have cited the Notes in the Edition 1541. by *Antony le Hay*. At the beginning whereof there is the privilege of *Charles the V.* which is the same with that given at *Brussels* in 1533. *Novemb. 21.* in the 14th. Year; this Prince's Reign, for the Edition 1534. which is the second as appears by the Preface before it.

We see by this Preface, that those which were employ'd in this Affair compared afresh the *Latin* Edition with the most ancient Copies they could find. *We have* (say they) *again compar'd the Vulgar Edition with the ancient and most correct Copies, so industriously, that we do not think any important passage has escap'd us, having perform'd that which at the beginning of our first Edition we desired.*

*Prod. de la
seconde
Edit. de la
Bibl. Fr.
l'Anvers.*

They refer to these divers readings of the *Latin Exemplars* rather than the *Hebrew*, the Observation in the Critical History of the Old Testament upon this Version, which informs us, *Genesis 3. v. 15.* they have *cette semence brisera*; instead of *ipsa conteret*, in the Vulgar, and the Pronoun refers to the precedent *Word Mulier* and not to *semen*. But they found some *Latin MSS.* wherein it is *ipse conteret*.

In fine, we must not expect any great skill in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Tongues, amongst the Translators of this Version. It does not appear that they read the *Hebrew* and *Greek* in the Originals, but only in the *Latin* Translations made before from them. But though it be so, 'tis certain, that the first *Antwerp French Bible* review'd by some of the *Louvain* Divines, is the first Translation into our Language with any exactness.

I shall not here distinguish the *French Bibles* into two Classes, as I have in the Critical History of the Old Testament, where I have divided them into *Catholick* and *Protestant* Versions. For knowing that there is but one *French* Translation, and that all the rest are but that review'd and corrected by several Persons in several places, I thought it better to follow the order of time, wherein they were published.

The second *French Bible* is that of *Robert Olivetan*, whereof I have spoken at large in another place. *The Translator* (says *Turretin*) *was earnestly desired by the Churches of the Vallies of Piedmont to publish an Impression thereof at Neuschatel: This first production being the Ground-plot of the rest.* He speaks of the *Genevian Bibles* which had been several times review'd and corrected. But we may say, and that very truly, that the *French Bible* printed at *Antwerp* 1530. has serv'd for a Foundation to *Robert Olivetan*.

*Crit. Hist.
of the Old
Test. Book
2. Ch. 24.*

*Turret Def.
des vers. de
Gen. p. 136.*

*Bib. Franc.
de Rob.
Olivetan en
1535.*

Who have observ'd in the Critical History of the Old Testament, that this Interpreter did not understand the *Hebrew* Tongue, and we have reason to doubt whether he was sufficiently skill'd in the *Greek* to Translate the New Testament out of the Original. In my opinion, his

chiefest

chiefest Excellency consists in the amending some fauks in the *Antwerp* Bible, caus'd mostly by the Orthography of words. And his Corrections are sometimes ill founded.

For Example, the *Antwerp* Version begins the Epistle to the *Romans* thus, *Paul serviteur de Jesus Christ appellé pour estre Apostre, separé pour annoncer l'Evangile de Dieu, laquelle il avoit devant promis par ses Prophetes es saintes Escriptions parlantes de son fils qui luy a esté fait de la semence de David selon la chair, qui est declairé fils de Dieu en puissance selon l'esprit de saintification par la resurreccion d'entre les morts de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ par lequel nous avons reçu grace & office de Apostre.*

Now let us see how *Olivet* renders this place. *Paul serviteur de Jesus Christ appelle pour estre Apostre separé pour annoncer les bonnes nouvelles de Dieu lesquelles il avoit devant promises par ses Prophetes es saintes Escriptions parlantes de son fils qui a esté fait de la semence de David selon la chair qui a esté declairé fils de Dieu en puissance selon l'esprit de saintification par la resurreccion d'entre les morts de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ par lequel nous avons reçu grace & office d' Ambassadeur.*

'Tis obvious at first sight, that this last Translation is the same with the first, except those two words which he has very imprudently chang'd. He has also put two words in different Characters to purifie the sense . . . *Olivet* without doubt had much better have used the word *Apostre*, than put *Ambassadeur* in its place. This first *Genevian* Translator's learning does not extend much farther than these sort of alterations, neither is he very uniform in his Emendations. For he has rendred the 1st. Epist. of *Tim.* ch. i. v. 1. *Paul Apôstre de Jesus Christ*, and has Translated the beginning of the 2^d. Epist. *Tim.* *Paul Ambassadeur de Jesus Christ.*

To make appear what I have said, 'tis worth while to cite some Examples of *Olivet*'s Version. The *Antwerp* Bible 1st. Epist. *Tim.* chap. 2. v. 5. runs thus, *Il est ung Dieu & ung Mediateur de Dieu & des hommes l'homme Jesus Christ qui s'est donné soy mesme en redemption pour tous auquel je suis mis Predicateur & Apostre.* *Olivet* has it thus, *Il est ung Dieu & ung Moyenneur de Dieu & des hommes, l'homme Jesus Christ qui s'est donné soy mesme la r ancon pour tous auquel je suis mis Herault & Ambassadeur.*

In the third Chapter of the same Epistle, v. 1. which the *Antwerp* Version renders thus. *Si aucun desire l'office d'Evesque il desire bon œuvre: car il faut que l'Evesque.* Which *Olivet* translates thus, *Si aucun appetit l'office de Surveillant il desire bonne œuvre. Il faut donc que le Surveillant.* In the 12th. verse of the same Chapter, instead of these words in the *Antwerp* Bible, *Les Diacres soient maris d'une seule femme*, he has put, *Les Ministres soient maris d'une seule femme.* In the 5th. Chapter of the same Epistle v. 17. where we read in the *Antwerp* Version, *Les Prêtres qui president bien soient reputés dignes de double bonheur.* *Olivet* has it, *Les Anciens qui president bien soient reputés dignes de double bonheur.*

In fine, this first *Genevian* Translator's greatest effort is the Degradation of Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Preachers, and the Apostles themselves, and substituting in their stead Supervisors, Elders, Ministers, Heralds, and Ambassadors. *St. Paul* writing to the *Philippians* addresses himself thus to them, in the *Antwerp Bible*, *à tous les saints en Jesus Christ qui sont en Philippes avec les Evesques & Diacres*: But in that of *Olivet* thus, *à tous les saints en Jesus Christ qui sont en Philippes avec les Surveillans & Ministres*. 'Twould be useless to note several other alterations of this nature, which are in *Olivet*'s Version.

I believe these alterations were rather the effects of the Translator's Ignorance than Malice; he living in a place where they did not love to hear the names of Bishops, Priests, and other Ecclesiastical Ministers, accommodated himself to the Language of his Party; he might also think he honour'd the Apostles, in calling them Ambassadors. But after all, except these, and a few more alterations, *Olivet* does not much differ from the old *Antwerpian Version*, except those places wherein it differs from the ordinary Greek.

I'll produce an instance of the agreement of these two Translations, taken from *Matth. 26. v. 26, 27, 28.* about which the Controversists frame so many difficulties. This place in the *Antwerp French Bible* runs thus, *Et comme ils souppoient Jesus print du pain & le beneist & rompiſt. Puis le donna a ses disciples, & dist prenes & mengies, ce, est mon corps; & en prenant le calice rendist graces à Dieu & leur donna disant beuvez tous de ce: car ce, est mon sang du nouveau testament, lequel est espandu pour plusieurs en la remission des peches.*

Olivet renders it in the same Expressions, only instead of *comme ils souppoient*, he has *comme ils mangeoient*, and to conform the more strictly to the Greek, he changes the word *calice* to *hanap*; because says he in his Notes, 'tis not *καλὶξ* in the Greek, but *ποτήριον*, which signifies all kind of Cups. Besides, he has put the Pronoun *le* in a Character different from the Text of the Version, to shew that 'tis added, and not in the Original; which is a clear proof of his exactness. These sort of Additions are of the same Letter with the Text in the *Antwerp Version*.

The last Translators have at least in their second Edition, put those words between two Crotchets, which they thought were only in the Vulgar, and not in the Greek, as in the 2. Ep. of *St. Peter*, ch. 1. v. 10. which they have Translated thus, *Prenés payne que [par bonnes œuvres] vous faciés certaine vostre vocation.* Now in my Opinion they had better have noted the difference between the Vulgar and Greek, in the Margent of the *Antwerp Bible*, than distinguish it from the Text by Crotchets; because they profess'd to Translate the Vulgar Latine, and not the Original Greek. There is nothing of this kind in *Olivet*, because he conforms to the Greek.

In fine, *Robert Olivetan* has put small Notes in the Margent of his Version, like those of the Ancient Translation: He does not scruple to note the various and most important Readings of the Greek Copies; as we may judge by his Observation upon the last verse of the 7th. of *St. John*. *This History* (meaning the History of the Adulterous Woman,) is wanting in several Exemplars, according to *Chrysostome*, *Theophylact*, and *Nonnus*. * But *Eusebius* in his History, Lib. 3. at the end, recites it as written in the Gospel (entitled) to the Hebrews.

The 1st. Epistle of *St. John*, ch. 5. v. 7. both in his, and the *Antwerp* Version, runs thus, *Car il y en a trois qui donnent témoignage au ciel, le Pere, la Parole & le Saint Esprit & ces trois sont un*. But he adds this Note in the Margent. *This sentence is wanting in several Ancient Greek, as well as Latine Copies*. By which appears his accuracy in not authorising any thing, the Truth whereof he was not fully convinc'd.

Calvin, in his Latine Encomium on *R. Olivetan*, does not praise him so much for Learning, and a penetrating Judgment, as his indefatigable Industry in this Affair. *Homo*, says he, *nec ingenio tardus, nec eruditio- nis inops, quantum industriâ, studio, sedulitate, adniti potuit summâ fide in hoc officio interpretandi versatus est*. Joan. Calv. in Epist. quæ præmit. Vers. Rob. Oliv.

The same *Calvin*, being not wholly content with *Olivetan's* Version, review'd and corrected it several times, but chiefly the New Testament, whereof the Genevian Ministers have publish'd several Editions separate: They have publish'd some with *Erasmus's* Latine on one Column, and *Calvin's* French in the other. The finest I have seen of this kind, is that of *Conrad Badius*, in small Characters. This Printer tells us, in an Advertisement before his Edition, That he was not the first that had publish'd these sorts of New Testaments in two Columns. Before every Book he has put the Summary, or Arguments, in Latine and French, which are the same which *Calvin* has join'd to his Commentary. Bible Fra. de Jean Calvin. En. 1557

The Notes in the Margent of this Edition, consist only of Synonymous Words, or different Interpretations of the same Greek Word: As for instance, *Mat. 3. v. 2.* where the Vulgar has it *pœnitentiam agite*. Now *Calvin*, in his Version, renders it *amendez vous*, and puts *convertissez ou repentez vous* in the Margent. In *Chap. 4. v. 23.* of the same Gospel, where we read in our Latine Edition *in Synagogis eorum*, conformable to the Greek, he has Translated it in his Version *en leurs Assemblies*, and *ou Synagogues* in the Margent; in short, he has changed several Words, which a long usage has in a sort Canoniz'd. The Ministers of *Geneva* have often placed those things in the Margent of their Bible, which ought to have been plac'd in the Text.

There are nevertheless some places where *Calvin* has been more moderate herein, than *Olivetan*; for he has restor'd the words *Apostle*, *Bishop* and *Deacon* in his Version, which the last imprudently alter'd. Yet he is not uniform herein; for he sometimes puts those things in

the Margin, which ought to take place in the Text: In a word, *Calvin's* Revise is not very exact. He only design'd to polish *Olivetanus's* barbarous Expressions, which make him often assume almost the liberty of a Paraphrast: And 'twas impossible for him to avoid this Error, he intending to make the Apostles and Evangelists speak more clearly than they themselves did; wherefore 'twas necessary to add those Words which were not in the Original; which often limits the Sense.

He has also rejected several Critical Notes, which were in *Olivetanus's* Edition, and might better have been reserv'd, at least in that excellent Edition of *R. Stephens*, in 1553. in *Folio*. He has (for instance) left out the difference of the Greek Copies in the History of the Adulterous Woman, in the beginning of chap. 8. of *St. John*. He has also omitted in his Revise, *Olivetanus's* Observation upon the 1st. of *St. John*, c. 5. v. 7. He, not content to publish a plain Translation, has shunn'd, as much as he could, all that was capable of raising a scruple in his Reader's mind. Those of *Geneva*, at that time, follow'd this method in their Vulgar Versions of the New Testament, they rejected the various reading, lest they should scandalize their common People.

In fine, at the end of *Conrad Badius's* Edition, they have added a small Dictionary, entituled, *A Collection of some difficult Words and Phrases in the New Testament, with their Explanation*. 'Twere to be wish'd that no Versions of the Scripture into Vulgar Languages should be publish'd without these kind of Dictionaries, which would render them the more Intelligible. By this we may see, that the *Genevian* Ministers have reserv'd several Terms in their Version, which were in a sort Consecrated by the usage of several Ages: but they are not uniform herein, having several times unnecessarily substituted others in their stead.

Let's see what they say on the Word *Eglise*, or *Church*, in their Dictionary. *Eglise*, say they, signifies verbatim a Congregation, or Assembly of People; but 'tis taken in the New Testament for the Society of the Faithful assembled in the Name of Christ, and according to the order which he hath Instituted. On the word *Eveque*, or *Bishop*, they tell us that *Eveque* is the same with Supervisor, or Superintendent; but it is taken for a Pastor, ordain'd to govern the Church.

They have also the following Observation on the Word *Pretre*, or *Priest*. Though this Word, Translated from the Greek into French, signifies Ancien, or Elder, yet because 'tis the Name of an Office, and that word Elder only respects Age: Likewise *Priest* being a word in use among the *Italians* and *French*, as well as *Greeks*, we have used it in several places. But they ought to have used it in all places where *πρεσβυτερος* is taken for the Name of an Office.

The Word *Diacon*, or *Deacon*, is not to be found in their *Dictionary*: upon the word *Heretick*, they say, *A Heretick is one that follows a Sect, which separate themselves from the Christian Union.*

Father *Veron* assures us, That those of *Geneva* had no other Edition of their Bible in *French* than that of *Olivet*, review'd by *Calvin* in 1559. But 'tis certain that *Calvin* refin'd it long before *Olivet*'s Translation, and that the Edition 1559. could not be call'd the second Edition of the *Genevan Bible*. He applied himself rather to the New, than the Old Testament, as we may see by the Preface to the New Testament, Printed in this place, in 1560. This Preface is dated October the 10th. 1559. And the *Genevan Ministers*, who publish'd this Edition, have these Words: *Though Mr. John Calvin, our Brother, and Companion in the Work of our Lord, did long since industriously labour in the French Translation of the whole Bible, but chiefly of the New Testament, which he has several times review'd, and compar'd with the Greek Text, as carefully as the continual affairs of his Office would permit, yet being convinc'd by Experience, That so great a Work cannot be brought to perfection, but by degrees, and that none was less contented with the precedent Work, than the Author, we requested, and earnestly desired two Learned Men of our Fraternity, fittest for this affair, namely, Mr. John Calvin, and Mr. Theodore Beza, that they would endeavour a Translation of the Old Testament, and revise the New.*

*Fran. Ver.
Epist Dedi.
de sa Vers.
Fran. au
N. T.*

*Nouvelle
Edition de
la Vers. du
N. T. de
Calvin en
1560.
revenue
par Beze.*

They had reason to join *Beza*, who had particularly studied the Greek, to *Calvin*, who was but meanly skill'd in it. But all his Judgment in this Language, only serv'd him to render the *Geneva Version* the more different from the simplicity of the Ancient Latine Interpreter, than it was before: we have a plain Example of this in *St. Mat. i. v. 11.* *Calvin* has it in this place *Josias engendra Jechonias & ses freres*, in his Edition 1555. conformable to *Olivet*, and the Vulgar, and 'tis so in all the Greek Exemplars. But in this Revise of 1560. they have rendred it *Josias engendra Jacim, & Jacim engendra Jechonias & ses freres*. *Beza*, in this place, prefers very few Copies to a very great number, and all the Ancient Versions.

Olivet contents himself with the ordinary Reading, and putting in the Margent of his Edition. Our Modern Copies are interlin'd with these Additions: *Engendra Jehojakim & Jehoakim, autrement Jehoakin, as appears 1 Chron. 3.* I believe, that by the Modern Exemplars, he would hint at *Colineus*'s Greek Testament, where this Addition is inserted. *Beza* had it also, as appears by the former Editions of his Latine Version.

We may observe here, That *Calvin*, in his Revise, re-establish'd several canonized Terms, which *Olivet* unnecessarily chang'd. *Beza*, on the other side, esteems it better to follow the latter herein, at least in some places; wherefore in his new Edition, 1560. he has restor'd the Word *Ancien*, Elder, instead of *Prêtre*, or *Priest*. We have for example

ample in Calvin's Revise, 1 Tim. c. 5. 17. *les Prestres qui president bien*, and in this, *les Anciens qui president bien*. In the 19th. verse of the same Chapter, Calvin has it, *Ne recoise point d' accusation contre le Prestre*: In that of 1560. wherein Beza work'd jointly with his Master, 'tis thus, *Ne recois point d' accusation contre l' Ancien*. In the 4th. Chapter of the same Epistle, v. 14. which Calvin reads thus, *avec l' imposition des mains en la Prestrise*, and in the Margent, *ou des mains des Prestres*: The Revise 1560. has thus, *avec l' imposition des mains de la compagnie des Anciens*, and in the Margent, *ou en l' office d' Ancien*.

It seems the Ministers of Geneva were willing to banish Priests from their Synagogues, and put Elders in their places. Yet we see that they acknowledg'd the word Priest to be a Consecrated Term, used in all the Western Churches, in their little Dictionary, at the end of this Edition.

That which most deserves Observation in this New Edition is, That the Language is more polite than the precedent; and consequently more different from the Vulgar, of which Olivetan retain'd several Expressions, because he copied the Antwerp French Bible. For Example, Heb. 7. v. 17. in Calvin's Revise is thus express'd: *Tu es Sacrificateur eternellement selon l' ordre de Melchisedec*; which is agreeable to the Vulgar. But in the Edition 1560. they have it *à la facon de Melchisedec*. These Ministers have not been always happy in their Corrections, for we see some French Expressions as ridiculous, as those they blam'd in Castellio, as Ephes. 2. v. 19. where 'tis *citoyens avec les Saints* in Calvin's Revise, but in this 1560. *combourgeois des Saints*.

I could produce a greater number of Editions of the Genevian Bibles, chiefly of the New Testament, but they are not very exact; and besides, 'tis certain, that these Ministers only Corrected the former Editions from time to time; they always work'd on the Foundations of others, which they improved according to their custom: They only designed to make the Scripture speak plainer than it could, and according to their prejudices; 'twas for this reason that they added their larger Notes at the end.

We need not oblige our selves to run through all the different Editions, but may judge of the Vanity of those of Geneva, by N. de Gallars's Epistle, at the beginning of a very fine Edition of the New Testament, Printed by Tournes, in Quarto. Gallars giving his Reasons for inserting his Notes in this New Edition, tells us, That he had closely follow'd those of his time, who had laboured in the Explanation of the Holy Scripture. As if the true Knowledge of the Word of God were confin'd to his party, he adds, *That he ought to beware of curious Spirits, that like Vaulters only skip about, wandring into sublime Speculations, which have nothing of solidity in them. As also, of those who wrest the Holy Scripture to their own Humour, making it a Nose of Wax,*

ridiculing God and all Religion, as we may observe for the most part in the Emissaries of Antichrist, and other false Doctors, whose only design is to enervate the truth. There is nothing can better preserve us from this contagion, than a true knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, which alone are sufficient to overthrow the Kingdom of Satan with all its Illusions.

This is no place to prove that there are not many people vainer and more subject to Illusions than the Calvinists of Geneva. They have certain common places which they use on all occasions, which immediately inform us what they can say.

I have not much to say on Sebastian Castellio's French N. Testament. Castellio's version. This person who was very learned in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin Tongues, did not understand our Language well enough to write it. He renders himself ridiculous by his inventing certain words, which he thought would best express the force and propriety of the Greek Words. Beza justly blames him for this in his Book against him.

We may judge of his Style by Romans 2. v. 25, 26, and 27. which he renders thus. *Si tu viens à trespasser la loy, ton rongnement devient avantpeau; que si un empellé garde les ordonnances de la loy, certes son avantpeau lui sera compté pour rongnement, & celui qui de nature est empellé & garde la loy te condamnera toy qui as la lettre & rongnement, & si trespasse la loy.* This Grammarian, imagining that the words *transgresser*, *circumcision* & *prepuce*, were rather Latin than French, has pleasantly used in their stead *trespasser*, *rongnement* & *avantpeau*. He calls that *empellé*, which the French term *incircuncis*. Also, what can be more ridiculous than this Translation of James 2. v. 13. *Misericorde fait la signe au jugement.* Apud Bez. Resp. ad Castell. p. 3.

Henry Stephens in an impertinent Book, which he publish'd under the Title of *Traité preparatif à l'Apologie pour Herodote*. He as well as Beza A Geneve in 1607. in 8°. is transported with passion against Castellio. He accuses him of exposing the sacred Book to the derision of the people, by expressions taken from the Language of Beggars. He has, (says he) given this liberty to all sorts, calling a Married Mans Concubine, which the Latins term, *pellex*, *arriere femme*, in allusion to *arriereboutique*.——He has also transform'd God into a Monsieur of Rochefort. If we will believe Stephens, his stile is a new invention of the Devil in our times to violate the authority of the pure and holy Word of God. But to do justice to Castellio, it must be own'd, that his fault has more of simplicity than malice. For endeavouring to quadrature the expressions of the French Language, which he did not understand, to those things which he knew, he has fallen into a strange indigested medly, as though Languages did not depend rather upon custom, than the caprice of Grammarians.

C H A P. XXX.

Of the French Version of the Doctors of Louvain, and that of Renatus Benoist, Doctor of Paris. Of the Last Editions of the Geneva Bible.

FAther *Veron* speaking of the *French Version* of the Divines of *Louvain*, gives it the name of *the first Version of Olivetan, printed at Neufchastel, and afterwards at Geneva, purg'd by the Doctors of Louvain, in the year 1557.* The oldest Edition that I have seen of this Bible, is that printed at *Antwerp*, by *Christopher Plantin* in 1578. with two Privileges of the King of Spain, one in 1572. and the other in 1576.

Ja: de Bay,
Monit ad
Bibl. Gall.
Lovan. ann.
1572.

There is besides an Advertisement at the beginning of the Book, by *James de Bay*, dated 1572. in praise of the Publishers. He says, (a) their design was to put a Translation into the hands of the people, the reading whereof should be permitted by the Bishops, or Inquisitors. And there being none yet that answer'd exactly to the *Latin*, and might pass for the true Text; several Divines of *Louvain*, who were intrusted with this labour, employ'd all their care about it. We see by this, that the principal design of this Version was to rid the people of the *Protestant French Bibles*, and substitute in their place another more conformable to the Ancient Interpreter of the Church. It appears further, from this Advertisement, that the reading of the Holy Books in vulgar Languages, was not indifferently permitted to all sorts of people. But in this they follow'd the Rule of the Index.

(a) *Viri quidam non mediocrem fructum accessurum existimaverunt, si ex tanta varietate editionum Gallicarum quæ passim manibus teruntur, unam eligerent quam Reverendissimi Antistites aut Inquisitores secure eis concedere possint, quos intellexerint ex hujusmodi lectione non damnum, sed fidei atque pietatis argumentum capere posse. Porro dum nulla occurreret quæ vulgata Editioni per omnia responderet, opera pretium duxerunt Theologos aliquot Lovanienses deligere, quibus curæ esset ut versio aliqua Gallica vulgatæ Latinæ fideliter responderet, quæ tanquam sano textu absque ullo liceret uti periculo, quod in hac translatione Gallica quorundam Theologorum Lovaniensium opera & labore maximo præstitum est. Jacob. de Bay, Monit. ad Bibl. Gall. Lovan. ann. 1572.*

Molanus who was Censor of Books, also gives his Approbation to the *Louvain French Bible* in these terms: *Hæc Sacrorum Bibliorum editio Gallica translatio multo labore Theologorum aliquot Lovaniensium est emendata & correctæ, ipsique Vulgatæ Editioni Latina fideliter respondet; ideoque summâ cum utilitate excudetur & distrabatur* 1572. die 2. Febr. *Joann. Molanus Apostolicus & Regius librorum Visitator*. When this Learned Man assures us, that the *Louvain Translation* answers exactly to our *Vulgar*, he would give us to understand, that it differs from the *French Version* made from the *Hebrew and Greek*. In short, they did not amongst *Catholicks* give the Laity a Bible which was not agreeable to that read in the Church. This was the design of the *Louvain Divines*. But having only Corrected *Olivetans* Translation review'd by *Calvin*, they have not follow'd the *Vulgar* so exactly as they would; if they had been the Authors of an intire Version of the *Vulgar*.

*Molan. in
Approb.
Bib. Lovan.
Gall.*

These *Divines* have so far imitated the *Geneva Bible*, as to take the little Dictionary aforementioned. I think with the same Title in the Edition 1578. and with very few alterations. Father *Veron* blames this *French Version*, because they kept three faults which were in the *Geneva Bible*. This *Genevian* (says he) first has falsified several Texts. 2. He has translated it from the *Greek* differing from our *Ancient Vulgar Latin*, out of a Contempt of it. 3. The *Old French*. This first review made by the *Louvain Divines*, purging the grosser errors has retain'd these three spots of its Original.

*Fran. Ver.
Epist. Ded.
de sa Vers.
du N. T.*

He produces besides thirteen passages in the *New Testament*, which he pretends, are considerable faults, because that the sense is chang'd, in the Important Acts of Religion. He calls them 13 principal faults remaining in the *Louvain N. Testament*, and in the Revisions of *Benoist, Bessè, Frizon, and others*. But if we carefully examine his thirteen passages, we shall find several of them faultless.

The Controversists being ordinarily not much exercis'd in the Critick of the Scripture, have I know not what method of disputing, which makes them condemn many innocent things. *Veron* for example accuses the Doctors of *Louvain* of Translating the 1st. Epist. *Corinth.* chap. 14. verse 22. *Les langues estranges*, according to the *Geneva Version*. And in verse 23. *estranges Langages*. The *Greek*, says he, does not import *estranges*, but is only $\gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha$ is, and in *Latin Lingues*, and in *French Langues*. He did not know that the word $\gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha$ signify'd a Barbarous or strange Language, as well as a Language in general. And we ordinarily term the Dictionaries of these strange Languages Glossaries. 'Tis also a fault in the *Louvain Edition*, as well as in that of *Calvin*, to put the word *estranges* in *Italick Letters*, as though it were not in the *Greek*.

Ibid.

Veron accuses the same Doctors of Translating with *Calvin*, 1st. Epist. *Tim.* ch. 3. v. 16. *Toute l'Ecriture*; where according to him they ought to have Translated *toute Ecriture*. But we have proved elsewhere, that the 1st. Translation ought to be prefer'd to the second, and that the *Calvinists* can conclude nothing from this place against the belief of the

Ibid.

Church, not from 1 Cor. chap. 14. This indeed would seem strange, if we should make the Scripture speak according to the Ideas of the Controuertists.

I am apt to think the *Louvain* Divines were not circumspect enough in their Revision and Correction of *Calvin's* Bible. Yet *Veron* does not always render them justice. He corrects them in several places where they were faultless. Nevertheless after having told us of thirteen pretended faults, which he calls 13 principal Errors, he cannot forbear adding: *If these Doctors of Louvain, and the rest of them had Translated the Bible themselves, they had not Translated it so falsely even without the appearance of truth, and so much to the prejudice of the Catholick Religion in these 13 chief faults, as well as others besides.* I must observe, that notwithstanding these 13 principal Errors, noted by *Veron*, those that continually publish the *Louvain* New Testament, have taken no care to amend it in these places.

Verf. Fr.
de Rene
Benoist.

Fr. Ver.
Avant prop.

If *Renatus Benoist* had not encountred a strong Confederate Party, his Version had gain'd as much approbation in the World, as that of the *Louvain* Doctors, whereof there are abundance of Editions. His first Edition appear'd in 1566. And the greatest faults the *Parisian* Divines charge it with, fall equally upon the *Louvain* Translation, as also on those of *Besse* and *Frizon*. Father *Veron* who herein agrees with us, says, nevertheless he can by no means infer that, because *Benoist's* Bible was censur'd, those of *Louvain*, *Besse*, and *Frizon* should share the same fate. Neither can I (adds he) blame these Authors for serving themselves of the *Geneva* Version, correcting and purging it. Where's the ill of this? This repurgation rather deserves applause. Wherefore may we not use the Vessels of Egypt, provided they are purified. He only blames them for that they had not sufficiently purg'd it from its impurities.

Edit. Paris.
in 4to. av.
1661.

'Twould be tedious and somewhat malicious, to relate here all the Proceedings of the Faculty of Divinity of *Paris* against *Renatus Benoist*. We may find most of them in a Book entituled, *Collectio quorundam gravium auctorum, qui ex professore vel occasione sacrae Scripturae aut Divinorum Officiorum in vulgarem linguam translationes damnarunt, una cum decretis summi Pontificis & Cleri Gallicani ejusque epistolis, Sorbonae censuris ac supremi Parisiensis Senatus placitis, jussu ac mandato ejusdem Cleri edita.* There are some things in this Collection, which don't add to the Honour of these Divines, they might indeed have us'd one of their Members more justly and moderately.

1574.

Benoist after several Years disputing with the Doctors of *Paris*, who incessantly provok'd him thereto, by advice presented a Request to them, wherein he submitted his Version intirely to them, with this Provision, nevertheless that they should conclude nothing without the authority of the Bishop of *Paris*. *Je vous soumetts* (says he) *ce que j'ay toujours fait & encore de present fais estant prest de l'executer par effet, comme aussi ay toujours esté entierement étant avec le dit Seigneur nostre Eveque & Prelat auquel*

quel comme l'approbation aussi la reprobation des livres appartient de droit les dites Bibles desquelles est question.

He protests in the same place, that his intention had always been to put down those Corrupt and Heretical Bibles, so common in our miserable France; in which, adds he to his Brethren, *If I have not perform'd all things so well as you expect, for the Love of God, and the Publick Good, be not so severe in your Censures, nor condemn, with so much Animosity, what proceeded from a good Intention, and is necessary in these times, wherein the Hereticks assail the Church, with corrupt and erroneous Bibles.* By this we see the Innocence and Justice of his Design; wherefore this Doctor could not be accused of any evil Intent, but only of having undertaken a work above his abilities.

This request, which only tended to peace, was no ways pleasing to his Brethren, who design'd his destruction: They had recourse to Cardinal de Pelvé, one of the chief of the League, which was then at Rome. They sent him a Letter sign'd, *The Dean and Doctors of the Faculty of Divinity of Paris.* Where we may see what chiefly contributed to the Censure of Benoit's Version, with so much severity.

The Letter begins thus: *We praise and magnifie our God, for that He hath establish'd you, next our Holy Father, Protector of our Nation, and much more of the Sacred Cause, and those who assert it. — We also praise and magnifie God for making you the first Instrument that oppos'd, and judicially declar'd against the French Bibles publish'd by Renatus Benoit, Curate of St. Eustache, having plac'd you President of the Privy-Council establish'd at Paris, during the Troubles.* They desire the Cardinal to use the best means he could with his Holiness, to induce him to this Version, complaining that they had not had Justice done them at Paris. *We, say they, waited upon Monsieur de Paris, who still promis'd to give us our Order; but for seven Years past we have obtain'd none. You also know, That in things of this Nature, there being no Parliament, We have had no Justice in France of our side.*

Lett. de la
Fac. de Th.
de P. r. en
Card. de
Pelvé.

In fine, they tell us in this Letter, That 'twas for this reason they had recourse to the Pope, after having advis'd with the Cardinal of Lorraine, and other Persons of Honour. They sent Benoit's, and the Genevian Bible to Rome, with their Censure, and some other Acts.

Arnoud, one of their Friends, being by his Station near the Cardinal de Pelvé, they recommended this Affair to him also, in a Letter which begins thus: *Sir, We have reason to rejoice that the Cardinal, your Master, is so near to our Holy Father, because of the Business of Renatus Benoit.*

Lett. de la
Fac. de
Paris au
D. Arnoud.

It could not be very difficult for them, who had so many Friends, and so near his Holiness, to obtain a Bull of Condemnation against Benoit's Bible. This Bull of Gregory XIII. which confirm'd their Censure, was address'd *Dilectis filiis Decano & Magistris Facultatis Theologicae Universitatis Parisiensis.* The Terms of the Condemnation were these:

Breve Greg.
XIII. adv.
Bibl. Ren.
Bened.
Rom. 3.
Novemb.
ann. 1575.

Vestram censuram comprobamus, nempe in ejusmodi opere deprehendi errores, hereses, blasphemias varias atque intolerabiles, aliaque tum in textu, tum in annotationibus, additis & præfationibus — Biblia supradicta omnino prohibemus, & ab Ecclesiâ Catholicâ sub anathemate rejicimus.

Submission
de Rene
Benoist.

Dr. Benoist being prefer'd by the King to the Bishoprick of Troye, could not obtain his Letters for admission from the Pope, and being Dean of the Faculty, he could not perform the Office of his Deanry, without submitting, and condemning himself his Version. The Form of his Submission before the Divines of the Faculty Assembled at Sorbonne, was thus: *Ego Facultatem Theologiæ Parisiensem matrem agnosco. Ego me meaque opera illius judicio & censura submitto; sed in primis Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, Apostolicæ & Romanæ — Biblia quæ meo nomine vulgata à Sede Apostolicâ & hac ipsâ Facultate damnata sunt, ego pariter damno, & ea falsò mihi adscripta, saltem ex parte, & aliena respuo.*

Versions de
Geneve.

They also propos'd eight Articles more to him before they would permit him to accept his Deanry, to which he also submitted: And to evince his perfect Reconciliation with his Brethren, he in his Will bequeath'd them two Thousand Pound, to found the Mass of St. Renatus. *Testamento reliquit bis mille libras pro fundatione missæ Sancti Renati.*

The Genevian Bibles serving for Foundations to some Catholick Translators, I shall add also something concerning their latter Editions. These Bibles may be reduc'd to three Classes: The first is Olivetan's Edition, in 1535. who review'd and adjust'd the French Bibles of Antwerp to his Fancy. The second Class comprehends Calvin's Revise of Olivetan: He also several times review'd the New Testament only, as well alone, as jointly, with Beza, and some other Ministers of Geneva.

The third Review which these Ministers made of their Bible was that of 1588. which was the largest, especially with respect to the Old Testament. Father Veron speaking of these different Reviews, reproaches the inconstancy of their Translations. But I cannot blame them for their frequent Correction of those things they thought not sufficiently exact. For we may make the same objection to the Catholicks. Has not St. Hierom amended the Ancient Version in several places, by Order of Pope Damasus? Nay, further, The Western Churches unanimously prefer'd the New Translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew, by this Father, before the Ancient One Translated from the Septuagint.

Turretin
Def. des Bib
de Gen.

Benedict Turretin, in a Letter address'd to the King, which is before his Answer to F. Cotton, speaking of those of Geneva, says, *We make no Authentick Text of our Versions, nor value them equal to the Original.* But they ought not, under this pretext, to Translate different from the Original, which indeed they have done. Those who undertook these Reviews being Ministers and Preachers, Corrected several places according to their prejudices. This indeed is the Fault of most of our modern

dem Translations of Scripture, for since Disputes arose in the World Sincerity has left it.

Turretin did very ill when he blam'd the Catholicks for preferring the Ancient Version before all the Modern Translations; for this is but reasonable: But on the other side, the inconstancy of the Protestants, who injuriously reproach one another for falsifying the Scripture, exposes them to the contempt of Judicious Men. If we should take the pains to compare the different Genevian Editions of the New Testament, we should find an infinite number of places Corrected impertinently and injudiciously; which is a clear evidence of their Incapacity, and vain opposition of the Churches Interpreter. Ibid.

'Twere to be wish'd that some Catholick Doctors would not speak of the Ancient Interpreter in such a manner, as might make the Protestants believe 'tis prefer'd in the Roman Church before the Original. If the Protestants were ingenuous, they would not cast these kind of reproaches upon the Catholicks. Let those of *Geneva* be as industrious as they will, in perfecting their Versions; let them correct them as often as they please, according to the Original, so they do nothing out of a contradictory Humour, purely to oppose the Ancient Latine Edition.

The Defender of the *Geneva* Bibles could not vindicate the Versions of his party, without unjustly accusing the Bishops of the Council of *Trent*, of destroying the Authority of the Originals for establishing the Vulgar alone. With what Sincerity can he assert this? *What some ignorant Parasites, says he, of the Roman Court did so vehemently against Erasmus and Budæus, the Council did against the Greek and Hebrew.* They, adds he, no longer judg'd it expedient to study to Correct the Copy by the Original, nor justify the verity of their Versions by the Hebrew and Greek. Now we Correct the Hebrew by the Greek, the Greek by the Latine, and the Latine by the Roman, the Church by the Court. Ibid.

Let us observe wherein the excellency of the Genevian Doctors consists, to assert such Falsities as contradict themselves: Yet their Imperinencies want not their effect on their own Herd, who imagine the Word of God to be confin'd to their own Bibles. We have Elsewhere justified the Council of *Trent* in the Affair of the Vulgar Version. And to convince even *Turretin* himself, by the Examples which he produces, that the most eminent of the Roman Court never blam'd *Erasmus* for Translating the New Testament out of Greek, Pope *Leo* the X approv'd his Version, and the rigour of the Spanish Inquisitors never disslik'd it; for they only condemn'd those who would establish their new Translations in the place of the Ancient One.

The Ministers of *Geneva* easily believ'd the Greek, by which they Corrected their latest Editions, to be the true Original. But they are herein oftentimes deceiv'd, and instead of the first Original, they give us an imperfect Copy; which has been alter'd, and may be amended by more exact Exemplars, and that several times by the Ancient

Versions. As for Example; where they say these words, in *Mat. 6. 13. Car à toy est le regne & la puissance & la gloire à jamais*, are in the Original; the most learn'd Criticks agree, that 'tis a Gloss inserted into the Text. As also those other words, *1 Cor. 10. v. 28. Car la terre est au Seigneur, & le contenu en icelle*. Which are no more in the most Ancient Greek Copies, than in our Latine, or the Syriack Version.

'Twould be easie to produce a greater number of Examples in this kind, by which it appears, that the last Revisors of the Genevian New Testament, did not always conform to the Original, when they dissent from the Vulgar. We may also apply the same Rule to those places where they have no diversity of Reading, but only of Interpretation: For 'tis certain that they have swerv'd from the Vulgar, where they had no occasion.

Though the Controvertists have not always done them right, yet they had reason to object against them the several impertinent Alterations of their Versions. *Veron*, for Example, might well ask them wherefore they change these words in *1 Tim. 4. 10. qui est Sauveur de tous hommes*, in their first Editions, to these, *qui est le conservateur de tous hommes*. They adjusted their Translation to the Sentiments of several amongst them, says this Jesuit, *who teach, That God is not the Saviour of all Men*.

In the second Chap. of the same Epistle, *v. 5.* in their first Editions we may read *un Moyenneur*; but in their latter they have put *un seul Moyenneur*. This word *seul*, which is not in the Greek, appears to be expressly added in their Version. The same *Veron* accuses them of having put in *1 Cor. 9. v. 27.* these words, *non recevable, afin d'appuyer la perseverance de leurs fideles*, in their Last, instead of *reprouvé* in their First Editions.

It cannot be denied that the Ministers of *Geneva* have by Correcting, accommodated several places in their last Editions to their prejudices, intending to oblige their Party with a Scripture agreeable to their Doctrine. 'Tis this which *F. Cotton* attempts to prove, in a Book on this Subject, entituled, *Geneve Plagiaire*. 'Twere to be wish'd that learn'd Jesuit had been a little better skill'd in *Critick*: As he runs through the Controversie he starts several weak Objections, which indeed 'twas difficult to avoid, in such a multitude of Passages as he produces.

CHAP. XXXI.

Of the French Versions of Bessé, Frizon, and Corbin. Of Father Veron's French New Testament, and of his Judgment concerning the Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the Vulgar Languages. Of Mr. de Marolles's Version.

THE French Bible of *Bessé* and *Frizon*, differ very little from that of *Louvain*, whereof we have been treating: 'T would be unnecessary to dwell upon the Versions that go under the Names of these two Authors. If we will believe *F. Veron*, the Revises of *Benoist*, *Bessé*, *Frizon*, and a Learned Prelate, ought to be attributed to the importunity of the Booksellers, who only design'd to advance the Sale of their Bibles by putting new Names in the Titles, although indeed only a few very old Words were alter'd.

Bessé publish'd his Version in 1608. and Dedicated it to the King: He also, in his preliminary Epistle, calls it a Pure and Faithful Translation, which had the Passport of Princes, the Verification of Parliaments, the Consent of Doctors, and the Approbation of Universities. We may find the same Impertinencies before *Frizon's* Bible, Printed at Paris, 1620. This Author, who was Canon and Penitentiary of *Rhemes*, and also Dedicated his Book to the King, testifies, That he had made use of the Catholick Doctors, And that he had us'd his utmost endeavours to amend the Faults left uncorrected in former Editions, and particularly in those of the Hugonots, in consideration of which some Vulgar Versions had been censur'd.

By this he would prevent the Objection which might be made against his New Edition, that it deserv'd to be censur'd as well as *Benoist's*. But to keep off this Censure, he cites some Words of Cardinal *Perron's* Reply to the King of Great Britain, which he had from the Mouth of the Bishop of Paris, afterwards Cardinal *de Gondi*, who himself censur'd *Benoist's* Bible, as well as caus'd it to be censur'd by the Sorbonists, and most desir'd the Pope to confirm this Censure. The Cause, says Cardinal *Perron*, of *Benoist's* being molested, was not his Translating the Bible, but for Printing the Geneva Version, which, although he thought sufficiently Corrected, had an infinite number of Errors yet left, which were observ'd by the Bishop of Paris, and the Sorbonists. But we have before prov'd, That the chief Authors of this Censure were the Leaguers, who mortally hated Dr. *Renatus Benoist*.

Father Veron acknowledges, That Bessé and Frizon's Bibles, as well as Benoit's, were the Old Geneva Version Corrected in some places: he will not have these Three Editions rank'd amongst the Hugonot Bibles, because they ejected the most gross Errors: And, as if we ought rather to consider the Translators than the Versions, he adds, *That the Heresie consists rather in the Sense than the Words*, which ought to be explain'd according to the Intention and Doctrine of the Authors. 'Tis thus he justifies those Doctors who approv'd these Three Editions, and did not compare them with the Latine Edition.

According to this Principle, the Bibles of Louvain, Benoit, de Bessé, and Frizon, are Catholick, even in those very places where they agree with the precedent. But not to complement them, they are no better than the others, if the same Errors are left in them. The intention of the Translators, and their Catholick Opinions, cannot make that which is in it self Erroneous to be Orthodox, in their Works. Frizon, in his Advertisement, exclaims against the *Evil, Heretical, and Perverse Versions of the Scripture*, which he calls the *Devils Bibles*; now his Version is not the better for resembling these Devils Bibles.

It does not appear very clearly, That the Approbators (who were Doctors of Divinity of Paris) had examin'd this Version; because their Certificate is in these Terms: *We being Doctors of the Sacred Faculty of Divinity at Paris, Certifie, That we have view'd this Bible, faithfully Translated from the Vulgar Latine, review'd by the command of Pope Sixtus V. and Printed by the Authority of Clement the VIII. and found good and Catholick.* Nevertheless, F. Veron assures us, That the comparison of this, and Bessé's Bible, with the Vulgar Latine, will evince us, that they do not agree. Wherefore we should not too often credit the Approbations at the beginning of Books; for it may be the Doctors have not read them, or at best, not sufficiently examin'd them.

Approb. de
la Bible
Franc. II.
de Frizon.

Frizon being afraid that his Bible might meet with the same Misfortune that Benoit's had, took all possible care to distinguish the Hugonot Versions. 'Tis for this reason that he adds, at the end, a small Tract, Entituled: *A Method to distinguish the French Catholick Bibles from the Hugonot.* This Treatise begins with this pleasant piece of impertinence. 'Tis easie for a Lapidary to distinguish the Diamonds of Rocher and Cambaia, from those of Alençon, and Pedlars Adulterate Gemms. He says, that the Catholick Bible is a true Diamond for its Purity, strong and firm in the Doctrine of the high Mysteries; that on the contrary, The Hugonot Bible is a false Diamond in its Errours, malleable in its Alterations, Opacous and Obscure, being judg'd by it self.

By this, we may observe, the capacity of those, among the Catholicks, who Publish'd French Versions of the Bible; 'tis this that makes ingenious men contemn all those sorts of Versions, and prefer those of Geneva before them, although they are less exact. 'Tis true, that Frizon produces several Examples, of the Differences, which he mentions, between the

the *Catholick and Huguenot Bibles*; by which, he informs the People, how they may know the *Geneva* and *Rochel Bibles*, althotgh they see, Printed at Lyons, or Paris, in the Title Page.

But it is not to be imagin'd, that all which he calls *Huguenotical*, was put into their Versions designedly, by the Ministers of *Geneva*: For, they professing to follow the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, 'tis not strange that they should differ from our vulgar in several places. For instance, This Translator's first Observation is on *Genesis* 3. v. 15. where the *Geneva* Bible has it *icelle semence*, and the *Catholick* only *icelle*, only referring the Pronoun to the Woman.

Frizon draws up a Charge against those of *Geneva*, for adding the Word *semence* in *Italick*, which is not in the Original. But they were oblig'd to do it in this place to shun a double Sense, because the Pronoun is Masculine in the *Hebrew*, and refers to the Word *semence*. The Ministers of *Geneva* were not the first Authors of this Translation; but we may find it in the *French* Edition, Printed at *Antwerp*, in 1530. and review'd by several Divines of *Louvain*. 'Tis not necessary that I should enlarge upon these Methods, to distinguish the *Catholick* from the *Huguenot Bibles*, which contain only Controversie, and a good part of them are taken out of *F. Cotton's La Geneve Plagiaire*.

The *French* Versions, whereof I am about to speak, are only Revises of the *Louvain* Bible. *James Corbin*, Advocate of Parliament, publish'd a new Version, from the Text of the Vulgar Latine, in 1641. And not being able to gain the Approbation of the Doctors of *Paris*, who opposed these kind of Translations, they being rejected by most of them, he address'd himself to the Faculty of Divinity at *Poitiers*, who granted his request. There were two Doctors appointed, by order of Council, to examine this Version, who testifie, in their Approbation, That they had found the said Translation most Elegant and Literal, and exactly conformable to the Vulgar Edition of *P. Sixtus Quintus*, according to the Sense and Intention of the Holy Spirit. This Approbation is dated, Jan. 7. 1642. and the Impression of the whole Book was finish'd in 1641.

Father *Veron* praises the Advocate *Corbin's* Version, because 'twas translated from the Vulgar, and for this reason prefers it before that of *Louvain*: Yet he cannot absolutely approve of it, because 'tis too Literal Veron, A-
vant-prop. a Translation, and its Phrases are, verbatim, from the Latine. He says further, That the quality of the Scripture, for several principal Reasons, well deserves, that its Translators should be Doctors of Divinity, or especially well vers'd in Controversie.

'Tis certain that this Version is rude and barbarous in its Expressions, and that none affirm it Elegant but the Doctors of *Poitiers*, who call it most Elegant. Neither is it the better because reviewed and corrected by the King's most express command, is affectedly put at the beginning. 'Tis true, 'tis to be wish'd, that those who enterpris'd the translating of Ho-
H h ly

ly Scripture were well vers'd in Theologic; but it ought to be of another sort than Controversial: For Controvertists often see those things in the Bible which are not there, and restrain the Words, according to their Opinions.

In fine, F. Veron who dislik'd all the Versions of the Scripture which had been made till his time, and was moreover of Opinion that the Bible was not to be allow'd the Laity, yet publishes a Version of the N. Testament. He has only touch'd over that of Louvain, as appears by the Title, which runs, as follows, in the Edition 1646. *The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST, of the Translation of the Doctors of Louvain, reviewed and corrected so generally, that 'tis indeed a New Translation from the Ancient and Vulgar Latine Edition, revised by the express command of Sixtus 5. and published by Authority of Clement the 8th. compared exactly with the Greek, with the short and literal Expositions of every Book and Chapter.*— By Francis Veron, D. D. Preacher and Reader of Controversies to the King, deputed to the Writing of Controversies, and the Cure of Charenton, by our Lords, the Clergy. This Title comprizes the design and quality of the Translator, as he had been a Jesuit, and only left the Society, to have the more liberty to employ himself in the study of Controversie, so we shall continue to call him Father Veron.

Verf. Fr. du
N. T. par
le P. Veron.

His Version is dedicated to our Lords the General Assembly of the Clergy of France. In his preliminary Epistle appears what an earnest desire he had that the People should have a good Translation of the Bible in our Language. *For a long time past (says he) I could not observe, without regret and extreme grief, that the People had the Lives of the Saints so faithfully and purely Written in our Language, which are only express'd, as it were, in the Antitype; from this Prototype; whereas they had not that of the Saint of Saints; The New Testament of our Father; The Holy Bible; The Book of Life, any otherwise than together with many notorious Errors that remain'd therein, according to the first Version of Olivetan.* Although he begins his Discourse somewhat obscurely; nevertheless, in the main, he had sufficient reason, in regard that there were indeed very great defects in the Louvain Bible, which then was in the Hands of the People. However, it doth not appear that the later was abandon'd, or that his Version was substituted in its place.

Afterwards, in an Advertisement to the Reader, he repeats a great part of that which he had already alledg'd in his Epistle; He therein informs us, that at that time when he publish'd his Version, 30 years had past since he first addicted himself unto the study of Controversies, and that he had then attain'd to the age of 70 years: He professeth that he could not spend the time of his Old Age to better purpose than in composing this Work; and explains his Method in a few Words: *I have (says he) always acknowledg'd that the decision of Controversies, about matters of Religion, depends chiefly on the New Testament...* I have determin'd that my
chief

chief Care ought to be applied to the publishing of this sacred Volume, in our Language, by a diligent comparing of the Greek Original, with the ancient Vulgar Latine Edition.

He accuses the *Louvain* Version of being written in a barbarous and *Walloon* Language. I have publish'd (continues he) this Translation in natural *FRENCH*, and altogether purg'd from the *GENEVIAN* filth. But although his Version is neither barbarous, nor too literal, and a certain mean is therein retain'd, which ought to be observ'd by an Interpreter of the Holy Scripture; nevertheless, the *French* is not always pure, and there are also some places, where it might have been more literal without being barbarous.

Father *Veron*, likewise, would have done much better in adhering more exactly to the Vulgar; since the design was to exhibit to the People a Version of the New Testament, that is read in our Churches, and not the *Greek* Text. It were sufficient to insert the *Greek* in the Margin, in the form of Notes, or Illustrations, as he hath sometimes done.

He had no reason, for Example, to render these Words, which are thus express'd, in the Vulgar, in Chap. 14. of St. Mark, v. 65. *Ministri alapis eum cedebant*, by these, *The Servants did strike him with Wands, or little sticks*, whereas, he ought to have translated it according to the Vulgar, and even according to the *Greek*, *The Servants did strike him with their Hands*.

He hath committed the same Error in *Matth.* 26. v. 67. where he declares that he hath not translated these Words of our *Latine* Edition, *palmas in faciem ejus dederunt*; thus, with the *Louvain* Version, *they smote him on the face with their hands*, nor according to that of *Corbin*, *they smote him on the face with the palms of their hands*; but they smote him on the face with the branches of palm trees. The reason alledg'd by him, in the same place, is this, that it is affirm'd by *Scapula*, that the word *πάριζω* signifies to strike with a staff, or with a little stick. And indeed *Beza* hath likewise translated it according to this Sense, *bacillis eum ceciderunt*.

But Dr. *John Boys*, a learned Protestant, above mention'd, hath extremely well vindicated the ancient *Latine* Interpreter, against *Beza*: Joann. Boys. He avoucheth that those words of the Vulgar, *palmas in faciem ejus dederunt*, signifie to smite with the hand or fist, that is to say, *expalmarunt, alaparunt, palmis ceciderunt*. *Heinsius*, on whose authority he relies, had before him, with great learning maintain'd the Version of the ancient Interpreter of the Church, against those of certain modern Dan. Heins. Translators, *Interpres vetus* (says *Heinsius*) *cujus eruditionem plurimis* Arist. Sac. *in locis satis admirari non possumus*; quod *Evangelista ille dixit*, *ἐξέκοδ- P. 940.* *πισαν αὐτὸν, οἱ δὲ ἰππίζπισαν, & colaphis eum ceciderunt*; alii autem *palmas in faciem ejus dederunt*, vertit.

II. Exercit.
Sae. p. 238.

This learned Critick affirms in another place, that the *Greek Verb παίζειν* signifies in the best *Glossaries*, to *strike with the Hand*, and that some ancient Criticks have likewise explain'd it, according to the very same sense, *παίζειν de manu. Glossæ optimæ παίζω, expalmo, alapo, Critici veteres παίζαι, παλάξαι ἢ γνάθου ἀπὸ τῆ χειρ.*

F. Veron, who seems not to have acquir'd any other knowledge of the Greek Tongue, than that of being able to consult the Dictionary of *Scapula*, ought not so easily to abandon the Vulgar in this place, and in many others, since he professeth to follow it. He hath also, on good grounds, disapproved the Versions of *Louvain*, *Renatus Benedictus*, *Bessus*, and *Frizon*, on the account, that they were not Compos'd from the *Ancient Vulgar Latine*, solely recommended as *Authentick* by the Council of *Trent*; and nevertheless he hath abandon'd it himself, without any necessity. He ought at least to observe that the word *Palma* does not signify in this place of the Vulgar, *Branches of Palm-Trees*, but that which is called *the Palm of the Hand*; and therefore, according to his *Idea*, he should have Translated in *St. Matthew's Gospel*, *with Wands*, as he hath done in that of *St. Mark*.

However, He imagines that the World is much oblig'd to him on the account of his diligence, in Illustrating many Passages of the New Testament from the *Greek Text*, and for retrenching, by this means, a great number of difficulties. He produceth, as an instance thereof, the 4th. verse of the 1st. Chapter of the *Epistle to the Romans*; where he gives us to understand, that he hath not Translated with the Doctors of *Louvain*, *Bessus*, *Frizon*, and *Corbin*, *Predestinated*, but *was declared*; and subjoins after *Mariana*, that our Divines are mistaken when they would infer the Predestination of *Jesus Christ* from this word; and that according to his sense, this expression is clear. I am very apt to believe with him, That that which is usually alleg'd by Divines concerning the Predestination of our Saviour, with respect to this Passage, is not well grounded; but he ought not for this reason to depart from the Ancient Interpretation of the Church, under colour of exhibiting a more clear Sense. I shall omit divers other Examples of the like nature, which shew, that Father *Veron* is not exact in his Version, and that he falls into the very same Errors which he reproves in other Translators.

Moreover, Forasmuch as he was a Professor of Controversies, he hath adapted some Passages to his own Notions; as when he endeavours to find the word *Mafs* in the 13th. Chapter of the *Acts*, verse 2. where he Translates, *As the Apostles celebrated Mafs to the Lord*. The reason that he gives us for his Translation in this place, is, That the *Calvinists* had often demanded of him, In what part of Scripture it was express'd that the Apostles recited *Mafs*.

He

He justifies his Version by the Authority of certain Councils holden by the *Grecians*, wherein the word *Liturgie* in *Greek*, is taken for the *Mass*: As also, by that of *Erasmus*, who hath render'd it *sacrificanti-bus*: But he ought to consider, that in the *Vulgar*, we only read the general word *Ministrantibus*, which exactly answers to the *Greek* Participle λειτουργῶν. His design was not to translate *Erasmus*, but the ancient *Latine* Edition; neither is there any debate, concerning the *Ecclesiastical Writers*, who usually style that *Liturgie*, among the *Grecians*, which is call'd *Mass*, by the *Latines*. We need only to enquire whether the *Greek* Verb λειτουργῶν, and the *Latine* ministrare, can admit such a Restriction in this passage of the *Acts*.

Not that *F. Veron* is the first that hath translated after this manner; *Corbin*, whose Expressions are generally barbarous, by reason that he too strictly follows the Letter of the *Vulgar*, hath nevertheless render'd it thus before him, *As they celebrated the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*. Father *Cotton* hath also given occasion to this Interpretation, in his Treatise, Entitled, *Geneve Plagiaire*, wherein he undertakes to shew at large that λειτουργῶν ought to be taken in this place for to sacrifice, or to recite the *Mass*.

P. Cor. Gen.
Plag. de-
pr. iv. 25.

Father *Veron* hath annexed to his Version certain little Notes, to illustrate the most difficult places, and even sometimes describes the variations of the *Latine*, from the *Greek*; but he insists on matters of Controversie, rather than on any thing else. He hath likewise subjoin'd, at the end of his New Testament, *A summary Decision of Controversies*, by *Texts of Scripture*, and a small Tract of the *Falsifications of the Geneva Bibles*.

But that which is most remarkable, is, that there is no Catholick Author, of these later times, who hath so earnestly asserted the necessity and usefulness of the Translations of the Bible, in the *Vulgar Tongue*. Mr *Arnaud*, who does not delight in transcribing the Books of the *Jesuits*, seems to have taken pleasure in copying out his Discourse on this Subject. Indeed *F. Veron* was firmly perswaded that the Holy Scriptures ought to be given to the People in their Mother-Tongue: He vigorously opposes those who maintain'd the contrary Opinion, and that endeavour'd to Authorise it by a Rule of the *Index*, which is inserted at the end of the *Decrees of the Council of Trent*.

It were worth the while here to rehearse his own Words; Many Do-
ctors and Confessors (says he) teach both by their Practice, and in their
Sermons, that it is not lawful in France to read the Bible in French, even
of a Catholick Version, without the permission of the Bishop or Curate, and
have passionately inveighed in their Pulpits against some who have affirmed
the contrary; nay are even so inconsiderate, not to say worse, as to pretend
that the Council of Trent hath prohibited the reading of them, without the
afore said Permission, on the account that they find the INDEX EXPURGA-
TORIUS bound together, with the Acts of that Council, as if our Book-bin-
ders were our Doctors.

Frasc. Ver.
3. Avant-
pr. P.

Afterwards, he proceeds to shew that the Council never enjoind this Prohibition, nor so much as gave any Commission, or Order to do it. How, (continues he) *is the Bible a pernicious Book, or does it contain any impure Doctrine? Oh horrid Blasphemy! — I affirm, that no Doctor, without infringing all the Principles of Divinity, can maintain that there is any Prohibition of this reading in France, or any necessity of obtaining a Permission to read the Bible, by vertue of any Statute or Ordinance that obligethus thereto.* He proves his Assertion by this Maxime, which he avouches to be common to all Divines: *That a Law, though it were even made by a Pope, or a Council, much less an Ordinance of certain Deputies, which was neither promulgated nor receiv'd throughout the Province, being thus reject'd by general Practice and the contrary Custom, even of many Years, is not obligatory to this Purpose.* — Now the Law, or 4th. Rule of the INDEX of prohibited Books, (on which alone, or on certain succeeding Bulls of the Popes, Pius IV. and Clement VIII. and those two misunderstood these People ground this necessity of a Permission to read the Bible) was never promulgated nor received in France, but hath always been, and is there reject'd by the contrary Practice, and for a long space of time, even above 40 years.

Lastly, Father Veron, after having produc'd the express Words of the Rule of the Index Expurgatorius, on which he makes some very Judicious Reflections, adds, that this Rule is, as it were, a Medal with two Faces, and that it is good and useful in some places; but that the scandal which is thereby caus'd, with respect to the Protestants, may prevail to abolish it. He thereupon cites Vasquez, who affirms, that Custom can abrogate a Law: Moreover, he insists, that if there were any danger in this reading, it might be easily prevented by certain little Notes on the most obscure places. Upon the whole matter, the most learn'd, among the Jesuits, have not absolutely disapprov'd the Versions of the Holy Scriptures, in the Vulgar Tongue, the Church having only condemn'd the use of them in the publick Service.

Michael de Marolles, Abbot of Villeloin, who hath translated a great number of Books into our Language, is also the Author of a French Version of the New Testament. I have seen three Editions of them, the first whereof was Printed in the year 1649. the second in 1653. and the third in 1655. He hath not translated from the Latine of the Vulgar, but from the Greek, or rather from the Version of Erasmus, which was taken from the Greek Original. This he even declares himself in an Epistle dedicated to the Sieur de la Milletiere, prefix'd at the beginning of the second and third Edition. Some time (says he) hath past since I publish'd my Version of the New Testament; which I had compos'd from the LATINE Interpretation of ERASMUS, who seem'd to me to have very carefully follow'd the sense of the GREEK Text. And, forasmuch, as his Work being approv'd by the Doctors of his time, was much commend'd by Pope LEO X. I was easily perswaded that my pains would be acceptable

Verf. Fr. du
N. T. par l'
Abbe de
Marolles.

to many People, and that this *Work* might also be useful to those of our Nation, that are inspir'd with an ardent desire to search out the way to their Salvation, in the reading of the sacred Books.

Mr. de Marolles was apparently of Opinion, that he ought rather to Translate the New Testament, from the *Greek Text*, than from the *Vulgar*; but in regard that he did not understand that Tongue, he imagin'd that *Erasmus's* Version might supply the place of the Original. However, if we examine his Translation, we shall find that he sometimes abandons his Author to follow the ancient *Latine* Edition. He assures us, nevertheless, in his Preface, that he hath comprehended the Sense of the Originals, and that he hath adher'd even to the Letter thereof, without adding any thing but the Words that are Printed in the Text in different Characters. And this (says he) is more especially to be observ'd in the Books of the Holy Scriptures, wherein great Care ought to be taken to make no Alterations.

But it was difficult for a Man, who had no knowledge of the Language in which his Original was written, to be able exactly to follow this Rule. There are also very great defects in this Version, the particulars whereof it would be needless here to rehearse; it may be sufficient to affirm, in general, that the Abbot de Marolles was not endued with those Qualifications that are requisite for the composing of a good Translation of the New Testament. In the second Edition he corrected many things, concerning which, he had been advertis'd by the *Sieur de la Milletiere*. Moreover, in his Preface to the third Edition, he speaks to this effect, *I am much oblig'd in this third Edition to those who have been so kind as to give me Information, touching certain Errors or Inadvertencies that had escap'd in the former Editions, and particularly, to a renowned Professor of Divinity, of a famous City, situated on the Frontiers of GERMANY.*

This German translated the above-mention'd Preface into his own Language, wherein Mr. de Marolles discourseth, at large, of the Versions in the *Vulgar Tongue*, and gives an account of a very great number of them, though little accurate, according to his Custom: He omits nothing that may tend to prove that the Holy Scriptures ought to be translated into the *Vulgar Tongue*. The *Oecumenical Councils* (says he) never prohibited the reading of the sacred Books in the Mother-Tongue, but only those Versions that were corrupted by ignorant or malicious Interpreters; whence it happens that the Holy Bible hath been so often translated into all Languages, with the general consent of all the Churches.

Forasmuch, as he made his Translation for the use of the People, he ought rather to render the ancient *Latine* Edition, than the *Greek*, or the Version of *Erasmus*: He seems also to be somewhat Capricious, in regard, that in the third Edition, he hath annexed the *Vulgar* to his *French* Interpretation, whereas, it would have been more expedient,

according to his design, to join with it the Translation of *Erasmus*, to which he declares, that his *French* is conformable.

He hath Dedicated his Work *To the most Reverend, and most Illustrious Prelates of the Gallican Church*; and in his Epistle Dedicatory, prefix'd to the Third Edition, he makes an Address to them after this manner; *I am come a third time to present my Version unto you. — I have compos'd it from the Sense of the Sacred Text; I have carefully revis'd and corrected it; and I have associated it with the Latine Translation receiv'd in the Church, as the most pure of all Versions, and that which is solely call'd Authentick by the last Oecumenical Council.*

If the Abbot de *Villeloin* were perswaded that the Vulgar is the best of all the Translations, he was very much mistaken in not following it, rather than that of *Erasmus*. Moreover, He shews little Discretion in exhibiting to the People the Scriptures different from those that are read in the Churches; for in regard that the Ancient Version hath been in use many Ages before the Western Schisms, it is free from all sorts of prejudicate Alterations, and consequently more proper to be put into the hands of the Ignorant People, than all the Modern, which have been compos'd from the Originals.

C H A P. XXXII.

Of the Version of Father Amelote: An Examination of his Preface; and of some other Pieces which are annexed to the first Edition of this Version.

WE ought to do so much Justice to Father *Denis Amelote*, Priest of the Oratory, as to acknowledge, That he is the first of the Catholick Writers who hath diligently applied himself to the Translating of the New Testament into *French*. He was a perfect Master of that Tongue, and had acquir'd a sufficient knowledge of the *Greek* and *Latine*, at least, so far as to be able to avoid falling into gross Errors: Moreover, he had been particularly addicted to the Study of the Bible, before he undertook to Translate it.

But having been the Disciple of Father *Gondren* the Second, General of the Oratory, whose Mind abounded with Sublime and Mysterious Notions, he rather Studied the mystical Sense of the Scriptures, than the Literal; and this is the principal cause that hath hinder'd him from making an exact Translation of the New Testament; not but that he very well understood that the knowledge of the Oriental Tongues, and
of

of the Critical Art, were absolutely necessary for the accomplishing of his Design; but in regard that it was very late ere he entred upon this course of Studies, he could not entirely lose his former Ideas.

He was well skill'd in Scholastical Divinity; and although he profess'd to follow the Sentiments of the *Thomists*; nevertheless he ceas'd not to be one of the greatest Enemies that the *Jansenists* ever had in *France*. We find a very strange description of them in his preliminary Epistle, wherein addressing himself to the * Archbishop of *Paris*, he breaks forth * *Mr. de* into these Expressions: By the reading of this Book — you will be con- *Prefixe.* firm'd in the Zeal which hath caus'd you to take up Holy Arms for the Defence of the True Grace, and the Decrees of the Holy See, being follow'd by the whole Church against the new Heresie. You will be daily fortified against these blind Rebels, whose Fury, Impostures, and Calumnies, add more lustre to your Glory, by endeavouring to obscure it, and place you in the rank of the *Athanasius's* and the *Hilary's*, by persecuting you with the same outrages as were committed by the *Arians* against those Holy Bishops.

I have seen this Epistle only in the first Edition of F. *Amelote's* Version, the former part whereof was Printed with Notes, in the Year 1666. at a time when they who are call'd *Jansenists*, enjoy'd a profound Peace in *Paris*. Mr. *Arnauld* afterwards employ'd certain Persons to entreat this Father to take away from his Epistle the words that we have even now cited, but he could obtain nothing. Furthermore, it was expedient to make this remark, since it discovers to us the disposition and qualifications of the present Translator.

Father *Amelote* distinguishes himself, even in the beginning of his Preface, from the Protestant Authors, who Translated the Bible on their own account. *This Translation of the New Testament in our Tongue*, (says he, in speaking of his own) proceeds from a Principle far different from that which in the last Age produc'd those of *Wirtemberg* and *Geneva*: Those were not undertaken but through the persuasion of Men. — Whereas this being compos'd by the special command of the Bishops, as appears from their Testimony, and the King's Letters, bears the mark of the Divine Order and Mission.

This Father would thereby give us to understand, that he was chosen by an Assembly of the Clergy of *France*, as he declares in another place, to Translate the Bible into *French*; and this is that which he calls his Mission. But a judicious Critick, who examines Matters in themselves, will not judge of the Fidelity of a Version of the Holy Scriptures by this Mission, which serves only to shew to the World, that the Author is Orthodox, and that his Doctrine not being suspected, his Translation may be safely delivered into the hands of the people.

Although F. *Amelote* makes no mention in that place but of the Versions of the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, nevertheless he design'd indirectly to attack that of the Gentlemen of the *Port-Royal*, which was then under the Press; for he fore-saw that it would hinder the Sale of his, and

he could not act better according to his own Interest, than to decry it, as proceeding according to his opinion, from factious Persons, whose Doctrine was suspected, nay, even Heretical, and who had no Mission.

However, Notwithstanding the report of this Father, his Mission is not so Authentick as he would persuade us to believe. I remember that I have seen him very much perplex'd about this Affair, at the time when his Version of the New Testament was ready to be publish'd; for some of the most Eminent of the Clergy of *France* withstood it, conformably to what had been determin'd in the Assembly which was conven'd *Anno Dom. 1660.* wherein the Archbishop of *Rouen*, at present Archbishop of *Paris*, presided: For this wise Prelate, who had a respect for *F. Amelote*, forbore not to oppose him on this occasion. Indeed some Bishops of his Friends, Members of the Assembly in the Year 1655, and among others *Mr. de Marca*, advis'd him to undertake this Work, but it was not done by a Decree of the whole Assembly, after mature deliberation.

They that most earnestly cried down *F. Amelote's* Version, were nevertheless favourable to him in this matter; for in regard that the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* intended likewise to publish a Translation of the Bible in the *French* Tongue, they promoted their own Interest in advancing his; they were content only to give it out when *F. Amelote's* Version began to appear, that it was theirs which he had caus'd to be Printed, it having been imparted to him, and that he had only revis'd it in some places. But we must do him this Justice, that he was at least as capable as they, of composing a Translation of the New Testament. It is certain, that he took pains therein, during many Years.

The Title of this Work shews that he design'd in his Version, solely to Translate the *Ancient Latine Edition, Corrected by the Command of Sixtus V. and publish'd by the Authority of Clement VIII.* He also clearly explains his meaning as to this matter in the Preface, wherein he declares, That he hath made use of all possible precautions to exempt his Translation from the defects whereof the preceding are accus'd.

F. Amel.
Pref. to his
Verf. of the
N.T.

Now one of these defects is, That they have not sufficiently adher'd to the *Vulgar*, to observe, says he, with due respect, the Decree of the Sacred Council of Trent, which declares it to be Authentick; I have exactly follow'd it in my Version, and I have had so great a Veneration for the same, that if the Reader attentively considers it, he will be edified thereby. It is true indeed, that this Father hath departed less from the *Ancient Latine Edition*, than the most part of *Catholick Translators*, who have preceded him; nevertheless, he hath abandon'd it in divers places without any necessity.

Id. ibid.

He adds in this same Preface, That he hath not denied the Original that respect which he was oblig'd to render unto it: I am, says he, so far from committing such a piece of Irreligion and Injustice, that in a
thor-

thousand places where the Latine leaves me in darkness, I take the Greek for my Guide and Light; and I extract from its Energy and Abundance, those Riches that the Latine Words could never have discovered to me.

Any one would believe, in reading this Paragraph, that F. Amelote had illustrated the Vulgar by the Greek in very considerable passages; but his usual custom is to express the least things by magnificent Words. He produceth, as an example of these Treasures which he hath extracted from the Energy and Abundance of the Greek, this Expression in St. John's Gospel, chap. 3. v. 13. *Nemo ascendit in Cælum; No Man hath ascended up to Heaven, &c.* He observes that the Verb *ascendit*, which is ambiguous in the Latine, because it may be taken either in the Preterperfect Tense, or in the Present, is manifestly in the Preterperfect in the Greek. *Was it not to be fear'd*, says he, *that I should not regard the alteration in the word ascendit in Cœlum, by explaining it rather in the Present Tense than in the Preterperfect; especially after having taken notice that even St. Augustine, in his Polemical Treatises, hath often taken it in the Present.*

Indeed there is some danger, with respect to those that are not capable of reading the Greek, but they that have attain'd to never so little knowledge of this Language, cannot fall into such gross Errors. St. Augustine was sufficiently skill'd in the Greek, to avoid them; but when he finds a Theological Sense that suits with his Conceptions, he neglects these Grammatical Niceties.

Another Treasure which F. Amelote gathers from the Greek Verb *ἀναβιβαιεν*, he *ascended*, in the Preterperfect Tense is this, *That we thereby convince the Calvinists that there is a third place different from Paradise and Hell, since when our Saviour spake these Words, None of the Just who died since Abel, even unto his time, had as yet ascended into Heaven.* It is to be fear'd, lest some Protestant should reply, that this way of arguing is more peculiar to one that professeth to decide Controversies, than to an able Critick, who is endued with an exact knowledge of the Stile of the Holy Scriptures: However, he had reason to affirm in the same place, *That the like Ambiguities frequently occur, either in the Verb, or in the Genders of Nouns, or in the relation of Pronouns, whose obscurity is immediately dispers'd by the clearness of the Greek Expression.* It is requisite only not to be altogether ignorant to avoid being deceiv'd, when these sorts of dubious Phrases are found in the Latine.

It is easie for example, to observe that in these words, *hic habet potestatem*, Acts 9. 14. the word *hic* is an Adverb, and not a Pronoun; because it is written in the Greek *ἐν τῷ*. Not but that the Advocate Corbin, and some others, who were not capable of consulting the Greek Text, have Translated it thus, *this Man hath a power.* The Louvain Divines have very well express'd that which is included both in the Greek and in the Latine, by these words, *even here he hath Authority.* F. Amelote hath render'd this Verse after such a manner, as may induce us

to believe that he himself hath taken *hic* for a Pronoun; for he Translates, *he hath likewise receiv'd a power*: Or, as it is Printed in the first Edition, *and he hath a power*. Now there is nothing that answers to *hic*, which is retain'd in the *Latine*, conformably to the *Greek*; but forasmuch as he is not very exact in his Version, and hath taken a great liberty to leave out certain words which he judg'd not to be necessary, it might be affirm'd that he hath omitted it on purpose.

This Father produceth, in the same place, other Examples of ambiguity, in some *Latine* Expressions of our Vulgar, and which cannot be taken away without consulting the *Greek* Text, as in the 2. Epistle of St. Peter, Chap. 1. V. 8. we read *hac enim si vobis adsint & superent*, and in St. Luke, Chap. 11. V. 41. where it is Written *quod superest date eleemosynam*. It is certain that nothing but the *Greek* can resolve the difficulty of those Phrases, *si superent*, & *quod superest*. This affords a good Admonition to those Divines, who neglect the study of the *Greek* Tongue, under pretence, that the ancient *Latine* Edition hath been declar'd to be authentick, by the Council of Trent. These Instances, and many others, that might be alledg'd, are evident Proofs of the necessity that there is to have Recourse to the Original Languages, for the Explication of the Vulgar; otherwise, we shall be liable to fall into gross Absurdities.

Moreover, F. Amelote intimates, in his Preface, that the *Latine* Words not always attaining to the same force as the *Greek*, he was oblig'd to apply himself to the Original, to express their whole energy; this Remark is Judicious and Worthy of an able Interpreter of the H. Scripture; but the Examples that are produc'd by him, in the same place, give occasion to doubt whether he were capable of putting his Observation into Practice. He informs us, that in the 9. Chapter of St. Matthew, Verse 36. where it is rendered, by the *Latine* Interpreter, *Vexati*, who read *ἰσχυμένοι* in the *Greek*; he thought it more convenient to Translate *languishing* than *wearied*, to express the Efficacy of the *Greek* Word: Nevertheless, *ἰσχυμένοι* in the *Greek*, and *vexati*, in the *Latine*, signify rather *wearied* than *languishing*. And therefore he would have done better if he had adher'd to the sense of the Vulgar in that place.

Furthermore he declares, that he believ'd that our Saviour's meaning might be more clearly explain'd, by rendring in the present Tense these Words, in the 14. Chapter of St. Mark, Verse 24. *τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον*, by these, *which is shed for many*, than in the future, with the Vulgar, wherein it is read, *qui pro multis effundetur*, *which shall be shed for many*. But he ought to consider that he translated the *Latine* of the Vulgar, and not the *Greek*. Now we find in the *Latine* Edition, as well in this place, as in St. Matthew, and St. Luke, *effundetur*, or *fundetur*. Indeed, the present Tense, in the *Greek*, is one of those sorts that (as to the sense) ought to be interpreted in the future.

It is on this account, that F. *Amelote* altogether opposeth the Judgment of the ancient Interpreter in this place, who determin'd, on the contrary, that in translating this present Tense, by the future, he should more clearly express the Sentiments of Jesus Christ, at least, if he read not *ἐρχομένου* in the future, as the Marquess *de Velles* hath found in one of his Copies, in Chap. 26. of St. *Matthew*, and Chap. 22. of St. *Luke*. Moreover, this reading of the Marquess is an evident proof that Father *Amelote* ought to have translated *shall be shed*, according to the Principles establish'd by him, in his Preface, and elsewhere; but he does not always observe an Uniformity.

That which he adds, in the same place, concerning the ancient Translation, call'd the *Italick*, does not seem to be very accurate. He affirms, that none can deny, *that it was compos'd from the most correct Copies that were then known in the World*: But who durst avouch it, at least, unless this ancient Version were any where seen after the same manner as it were extant in the beginning? It is certain, that (if we may judge thereof) from the state in which it was found before the Reformation of St. *Jerom*, it was extremely defective, and even very far from the Primitive Originals.

That which may induce us to believe that it was taken from certain Greek Copies which had been alter'd, is this, that these same Imperfections are apparent in some very ancient Greek Manuscripts, as I have shewn elsewhere: Wherefore, it is not a certain Rule always to correct the present Greek, according to the ancient *Latine* Edition, and thereby to judge of the verity of its model: For to this end, it ought to be entirely conformable to the Primitive Greek Originals, but this can never be prov'd.

Father *Amelote* grants, that this ancient Version had been heretofore alter'd by certain Hereticks, or ignorant Transcribers; But none can doubt (continues he) but that St. *Jerom* hath restor'd it to its primitive purity, through the means of such Greek Copies, as were very exact, and most like unto the Originals. It is true, indeed, as I have declar'd in the first part of this History, that St. *Jerom* hath perform'd a considerable piece of Service to the Western Churches, in correcting from good Greek Manuscripts, their ancient Version, the Alterations whereof had been made rather by the Orthodox, than by the Hereticks, since they were found even in many very ancient Greek Copies.

But, forasmuch, as this learn'd Father, in his Correction, has only observ'd the ordinary Rules of the Critical Art, how can it be so peremptorily averi'd, that he had in his possession any Greek Copies that were most like unto the Apostolick? However, let us give ear to the Arguments of F. *Amelote*, who grounds his Ideas on the express Words of St. *Jerom*. This great Saint (says he) *was equally inquisitive and learned, and he testifies, that his Greek Books of the Gospel were Ancient,*
Apo.

Apostolick and True, and they are call'd by him a clear Water of a most pure Fountain.

None can dispute with St. Jerom his great learning and diligence, in searching out the best *Greek* Manuscripts of the New Testament, that were extant in his time; but it cannot be concluded, from thence, that he retain'd in his Hands the primitive Originals of the Apostles; when he ascribes to his Copies the Name of *Ancient, Apostolick and True*, he only design'd to intimate by those Words, that the *Latine* Edition of his time being very much corrupted, it was absolutely necessary to correct it by the *Greek* Original, which he calls *Ancient, Apostolick and True*, because the Evangelists, and the Apostles, wrote in this Language, and not in the *Latine*. He likewise attributed these same Qualifications to the *Hebrew* Text, which is often styl'd by him *Veritas Hebraica*, when he would authorize his New Translation of the Old Testament, from the *Hebrew*. Can it then be avouch'd, for this reason, that he had the real Manuscripts of *Moses*, and the Prophets, or at least such Copies as were most like unto these Primitive Originals?

Therefore, we ought not too easily to give credit to F. Amelote, who infers from the above-cited Words of St. Jerom, that *when the present Greek is found to be different from this ancient Translation, which has been preserv'd by the Church as the apple of her Eye, we ought to make no difficulty in believing that in these places it hath suffer'd some Alteration, through the malice of the Enemies of the Truth, or the negligence of Transcribers; who sees not, at the same time (continues he) that strictly to follow this venerable Latine in these Occurrences, is to render more respect, and to shew greater fidelity to the Apostolick Original, than to prefer before it a Greek Edition, which in so long a process of time, might admit an infinite number of Corruptions.*

If this Father had carefully perus'd the Epistle of St. Jerom, to Pope *Damasus*, wherein he explains the method, observ'd by him, in his Reformation of the *Latine* Gospel, he would not have so positively affirm'd, that the *Greek* hath suffer'd Alteration, through the malice of the Enemies of the truth, or the negligence of Transcribers, in those places where it differs from the ancient Translation of the Church. It is certain that this ancient Edition was in a very ill state before it was revis'd by St. Jerom: for it varied so far from the authentick *Greek* Copies, by which he corrected it, that he durst not introduce all the Reformation that it requir'd: He had regard only to those places where the sense appear'd to him to be alter'd, leaving many others as they were before; although they also stood in need of Correction.

I would willingly demand of F. Amelote, whether it were expedient to correct the present *Greek* from a Translation, wherein St. Jerom himself declares, that he hath left some things on purpose, to the end, that he might not seem to depart too far from the ancient Edition, *Quæ* (Evangelia) *ne multum à lectionis Latine consuetudine discrepant, ita*

Jerom.
Pref. in iv.
Evang. ad
Dam.

ca-

calamo temperavimus, ut his tantum quæ sensum videbantur mutare correctis, reliqua manere pateremur ut fuerant, can he affirm, after this, that the purity alone of the Latine, taken from the most ancient Greek, is a manifest proof of the Alteration of the Vulgar Greek. This is the name that he gives to the present Greek Text.

He has not consider'd that the Old Latine Edition, revis'd by St. Jerom, was conformable to the most ancient Greek Copies, and perhaps, even to such as were more ancient than those that were made use of by this Father: For, as I have already shewn, divers readings are authoriz'd by St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian, which St. Jerom hath corrected, and he might have corrected many others, by his Copies, which he believ'd to be more exact. However, he thought fit to leave these small defects in his Latine Edition, which consequently cannot serve as a Model, for the present Greek, in all the places where it does not agree with this Edition, although it were consonant in those passages to some very ancient Greek Copies. It is sufficient to have prov'd that the ancient Edition, which was in use, in the Latine Church, before St. Jerom, was conformable to the ancient Greek Copies that were not genuine.

F. Amelote assures us, in vain, that he has diligently search'd into all the ancient Greek Manuscripts, and that, *besides this, he hath applied so great Care, as the like has scarcely been hitherto taken, to shew the conformity of the Latine to the ancient Greek, and to the Primitive Original*. But all this pretended search becomes uselels, at least, if we are not able to discern the good Copies from the bad. Wherefore, he hath had a false Idea of this ancient Greek, to which he appropriates the name of the Primitive Original; and this has frequently led him into error.

However, it is worth the while to hearken to the Discourse of this Father, who had a very good design, but was not able to accomplish it. *I have made, says he, as diligent a search as possibly I could, into all the Greek Manuscripts, written above a thousand Years ago, and a little under, that I could discover throughout all Christendom, among which divers are twelve or thirteen hundred Years old, and many come near the same Age*. But I have intimated in the first part of this History, that F. Amelote does not seem to have been sincere, when he makes mention of this searching out of Manuscripts; for excepting two or three consulted by him in very few places, which are not above 4 or 5 hundred years old, he hath exhibited no various Readings, that have not been already Printed.

This great number of Mss. which he avoucheth to have been written 12 and 13 hundred Years ago, were never extant but in his Imagination; for if we except the Alexandrian, that is now in England, and which I never saw; the most ancient that we have, is that of Beza, which is at present kept in Cambridge; that of the King's Library, which is the second part thereof, containing only the Epistles of St. Paul, and

another, altogether like unto it, preserv'd in the Library of the *Benedictines* of *St. Germain des Prez*. Now it has been elsewhere prov'd, that these three venerable Mss. are not above a thousand years old, although they were transcrib'd from others of a more ancient date.

I know not what he means by *all those of the Vatican*; for as I take it, we have only under this Name the variations of one or two MSS. and he could not affirm that he made an exact search into them, since he does not produce any other various Readings but those that are printed; neither can I perceive what reason he has to say, *I have had sixteen of those of Spain, without reckoning others that were made use of by Cardinal Ximenes, for the perfecting of the Bible of Alcala*; for, he has only consulted these sixteen of *Spain*, in the Collection that the Jesuit *Lacerda* caus'd to be Printed, and which has been since Reprinted in the 6th. Tome of the *Polyglott* of *England*.

As for those of *Ximenes*, he never saw them but in the Bible that was publish'd by this Cardinal, or rather in the Collection of various Readings, set forth by the *English Divines*, in the vi Tome of their *Polyglott*, in which are mark'd, the place where the *Greek* Edition of the New Testament, of *Complutum* or *Alcala*, differs from others: Nevertheless, if we may give credit to the report of *F. Amelote*, he hath seen all the *Greek* Mss. that were perus'd by *Ximenes*, to render his Bible compleat. He takes so great delight in multiplying the Manuscripts of this Cardinal, that he sometimes cites those of the Bible of *Complutum*, those of *Alcala*, and those of the Cardinal of *Cineros*, as if they were three different Mss. although, it is evident, that *Complutum* and *Alcala*, are the same things, and that *Cineros*, is the Name of *Cardinal Ximenes*.

Moreover, this Father extends his *Ideas* yet farther; he discourseth of the *Greek* Mss. that were us'd by the ancient Interpreter of the *Latine* Church, whom he makes to be contemporary with the Apostles, as if this Affair had been communicated unto him: He also makes mention of those which *St. Jerom* has follow'd, in his Correction of the ancient *Latine* Edition, and gives us an Inventory of them: As also, of the other, in the Catalogue of his Mss. which he has insert'd at the end of the *Acts* of the Apostles. His Words, in that place, are as follow, *Veteris Interpretis Codices primæ ac remotissimæ antiquitatis, ex quorum tanquàm fontium puritate Latina Editio, quam Italiam S. Augustinus atque omnium præstantissimam appellat, jam ab Apostolorum temporibus dimanavit.* However, those Manuscripts are not found any where, but in the Imagination of this Father; unless, they were the same to which our *Latine* Edition was conformable, before it was revis'd by *St. Jerom*; neither can they be call'd *Pure*, and *Apostolical*, since they have been alter'd, in an infinite number of places, as I have already prov'd, in the first part of this Critical History.

Moreover, he reckons, among his Manuscripts, those from which *St. Jerom* corrected the old *Latine* Edition of the New Testament: He call

calls them *veros & Apostolicos*, as if they were really the true Originals of the Apostles, and all the others that differ from them were false and corrupted. *Quos (says he) spurios falsosque extitisse argumento docet (Hieronimus) quod à germanis verisque discrepant.* But we have elsewhere shewn, That St. Jerome never affirm'd that his Copies were endued with those qualifications which are attributed to them by Father Amelote.

P. Amel.
in Catal.
Codd. MSS

He exhibits a further description of them in the beginning of his Version of the Epistles of St. Paul, under this Title; *A Table of the Greek MSS. cited in the Notes, in vindication of the Vulgar Edition.* He declares in this place, That St. Jerome being about to reform the Old Vulgar, applied so great a precaution therein, that to this end he only made use of Ancient Greek MSS. and that he admitted no alteration in the Latine, when he found any difference between his Faithful and Apostolick Greek Text, (for so he calls it) and certain words that were introduc'd in process of time, into this Ancient Latine Version.

It cannot be denied that St. Jerome, who was an able Critick, Corrected the Ancient Latine Edition by very Authentick Greek Copies; but it is a Fiction of F. Amelote, to assert, That all the Readings of these Copies were altogether genuine, and perfectly conformable to those that were extant in the primitive Originals; nevertheless, this is the Idea that he represents to us thereof, when he describes in the same place, the second sort of MSS. which are cited by him in his Notes: *These are (says he) the Greek MSS. that were applied by St. Jerome, to restore the Vulgar to its Primitive Purity: He calls them True, Faithful, and Pure, and by these qualifications refutes the Vulgar Greek, or the Greek such as it is Printed at this day, when it is different from the Ancient Latine Version.* He supposes, without alledging any proof, a Vulgar Translation that perfectly agrees with the Greek Original of the New Testament. But in case we should grant, that there was extant a Vulgar of this nature, Where does he find that St. Jerome has re-establish'd it in its primitive Purity? This Learned Critick plainly declares on the contrary, That he has left therein many Faults on purpose, and that he has not Corrected it by his Greek MSS. so exactly as he might have done.

The third MS. produc'd by F. Amelote, is that of the Abbey of St. German des Prez, which contains the XIV. Epistles of St. Paul, in Greek and Latine: this indeed is real, but that which he affirms concerning it, is a clear proof that he is not a competent Judge as to the Matter of MSS. He seems (says he, in speaking of this MS. of St. Germain,) to have been a Grecian who hath written both Editions, not only because the Latine Letters very much resemble the Greek, but also in regard that it may be perceiv'd by the reading of the Latine, that the Writer did not understand it so well as the Greek.—The Greek thereof is extremely conformable to the Vulgar, although in many places the Latine is very different from it. By

which we may judge that this *Latine Version* is one of those that were extant, before the *Vulgar* was re-establish'd by St. Jerome.

Chap. 31. It has been prov'd on the contrary in the first part of this Work, That this Manuscript, and another like unto it, which is kept in the King's Library, were written by certain Persons of the *Latine Church*, and that they were not in use among the *Grecians*: The Errors are more frequent in the *Greek* than in the *Latine*, although they abound in both; for they that copied out those Ancient Books, only wrote a fair Hand in the Transcribing of Ancient Copies, but they were generally ignorant of Orthography.

It is not true that the *Greek* of these Ancient Copies is altogether conformable to our *Vulgar*, and at the same time very different from the *Latine*, which is annex'd to them; for the *Greek* and *Latine* of these Manuscripts are almost always uniform; and consequently this *Latine*, which is the Edition that was read before the time of St. Jerome, being consonant unto the *Greek*, it necessarily follows, that the later hath the same defects. Wherefore it is not a certain Rule to Correct the present *Greek Text* by this Ancient *Greek*, and to avouch that our *Vulgar* represents the primitive Original of the Apostles, in all those places where it agrees with the *Greek* of those Ancient Manuscripts.

It may be only inferr'd from thence, that when our Interpreter departs from the present *Greek Text*, he has follow'd other *Greek* Originals, different from those that we now read. And it is in this Sense that Beza reprov'd Erasmus for too easily abandoning the Ancient *Latine Version*, under pretence, that it was otherwise express'd in the *Greek*: He has judiciously observ'd that this Interpretation was conformable in those places to other very Ancient *Greek Copies*, which Erasmus had never seen.

F. Amel.
Pref. to his
N. T.

Father Amelote, who hath alledg'd the Testimony of Beza to confirm the Authority of our *Vulgar*, afterwards adds some Reflections, which seem not to be very sincere; or to do him more Justice, he understood not the Matter whereof he treated. If this Adversary of the Church, says he, preferr'd our *Latine Edition* before the *Vulgar Greek*, when he found it supported by the Authority of a small number of Ancient Manuscripts, which agreed with it: What would he not have done if he had seen all those that I have Collected, many whereof are Twelve and Thirteen Hundred Years Old; and the more Ancient they are, the more conformable they are generally to our *Latine Edition*? Lastly, It is apparent that he openly confesses, That the *Latine Version* was compos'd from a *Greek Original*, more pure, and more correct, than the *Greek* which is now in our possession; and consequently, that it would be unreasonable to require that I should set a greater value on this stream of muddy Water, than on the pure and Apostolick Spring of our *Latine Translation*.

I would willingly know what F. Amelote means by these MSS. written Twelve and Thirteen Hundred Years agoe, that he has perus'd, and

and which were never seen by *Beza*. Of all the Ancient Copies that are cited by this Father, there is only the *Alexandrian* which *Beza* could not consult, by reason that the *English* Divines first publish'd all the various Readings thereof in the *Greek* Edition of the New Testament, Printed in their *Polyglott*-Bible. If it be understood with respect to the variations of the Ancient MS. of the *Vatican*, they were set forth in the time of this Minister of *Geneva*, at least a considerable part of them: And as for the MS. of *St. Germain des Prez*, it is the same as that of *Clermont*, which was in *Beza*'s possession, and is kept at present in the King's Library.

This Protestant Divine has indeed acknowledg'd, That the Ancient *Latine* Version was made from a *Greek* Copy, which is sometimes more pure than the present *Greek* Text; but that ought not to be extended in general to this whole Version, which is only affirmed by him concerning some passages thereof; neither has he grounded his late Translation of the New Testament, but on the defects which he pretends to have found in the *Vulgar*: This proves that *Beza* did not believe that the Ancient *Latine* Interpreter compos'd his Version from the Pure and Apostolical Fountain.

Father *Amelote* has cited in his Catalogue divers MSS. that were never found any where, saving in his own Imagination: He reckons for Example in the number of his *Greek* MSS. those that were made use of by the *Syriack*, *Arabick*, *Ethiopick*, and *Persian* Interpreters; nevertheless, the *Arabick* Version, which is now extant, was taken from the *Syriack*, or from the *Coptick*, as I have already observ'd; the same thing may be affirm'd concerning the *Persian*, which was compos'd from the *Syriack*, and not from the *Greek*; it is likewise probable, that the *Ethiopians* Translated from the *Coptick*: Moreover, it hath been elsewhere shewn, that the *Ethiopick* New Testament, which was Printed at *Rome*, is not an exact Piece.

I admire that this Father, who had no knowledge of all those Languages, should so confidently avouch, That it appears by comparing divers places of the *Ethiopick* Version, that it was taken not from the *Latine*, F. Amel. (as some have imagin'd through a gross Mistake,) but from certain very Ancient *Greek* Copies. Catal. of his MSS. It is true indeed, That the *Ethiopians* have not Translated their New Testament from the *Latine*, but it hath been above prov'd, that the Edition thereof, which we have in our possession, Chap. 17. is very defective, and that it was not publish'd from good *Ethiopick* Copies.

C H A P. XXXIII.

A particular Examination of Father Amelote's Version, and of some of his Remarks relating to this Version.

I Am so far from blaming F. *Amelote* for having given us a French Translation of the New Testament, compos'd from the *Latine* Edition, that I could wish on the contrary, that he had never departed from it, even in those places where he believ'd that the present *Greek* was more exact: Forasmuch as his design was to put into the hands of the People, the Version that is read in our Churches, he ought not to abandon it to follow the *Greek* Text, as he has sometimes done. It were sufficient to observe in a Note, (if he judg'd it to be expedient,) that the *Greek* seem'd to him, in those places, to be more genuine than the *Latine*.

I cannot apprehend, for example, why he has preferr'd, in Chap. 11. verse 23. of the II. Epistle to the *Corinthians*, in his first Edition, a Reading that is founded only on the Testimony of the *Marquess de Velez*; I shall here sub-join the Reflection that he makes on this Expression, *I am so also*, which is added in his Translation in that place. *These words are not read in the Vulgar Greek, but the Marquess de Velez hath found them in the Ancient MSS. of Spain, &c. &c.* and I also: *This induces me to believe, That if the Roman Correctors had had in their possession a greater number of Greek Copies, they would have found many of them conformable in this passage, to those of the Latine Author; and they would have retain'd these two words, and I, which although they are not necessary, yet neither are they superfluous.*

This Critical Remark is not very considerable: he undertakes to reform the *Vulgar*, and the *Correctors of Rome*, in a place where he is not supported by any ancient *MSS.* either *Greek* or *Latin*, but only by that which the *Marquess de Velez* has read in one of his Copies, the qualifications whereof are unknown to us. These words are not extant in the ancient *Vulgar*, that was in use before the time of *St. Jerom*, nor in his Correction; and consequently they were not included in that *Greek* Text which F. *Amelote* calls *true and Apostolick*; neither are they in this *Greek* styl'd by him *the Vulgar*. To what purpose then has he observ'd, in this place, that they are not contain'd in this *Vulgar Greek*; since, in like manner, they are not written in his *True, Faithful, Pure, and Apostolical, Greek Originals*?

He thought himself oblig'd to adhere to the Vulgar, in the 6 Chap^r ter of St. Matthew, vers. 11. in translating these Words, *Panem nostrum super substantialem da nobis hodie*, after this manner, *Give us this day our Bread, which surpasses all substance*: But he is mistaken; for the word *super substantialis*, interted, by St. Jerom, in the room of *quotidianus*, which was in the ancient Vulgar, imports the same thing, in that place, as *additus substantie*, according to the signification of the Greek word *ἐπιτιμιμα*. And therefore he would have done better in rendring it *daily*, with the greatest part of other Interpreters.

A Judicious Translator ought always to have regard to the Greek Original, to the end, that he may be able to take away the ambiguity, that sometimes occurs in the *Latine* Expressions: If he had propounded to himself this Rule, and had exactly follow'd it, he would not have thus interpreted these Words, of the Epistle to the *Colossians*, Chap. 4. v. 16. *& eam quæ Laodicensium est vos legatis*; you shall likewise read that which I wrote to the Laodiceans; for it is express'd, in the Greek, without any diversity of reading *ἐκ Λαοδικείας*, written from Laodicea.

Moreover, he seems not to have comprehended the energy of certain Greek Words, that are retain'd in the *Latine*, as that of *baptizare*, which signifies to *dip* or *plunge*; therefore, it ought not to be translated, as he hath done, with the Version of *Geneva*, in the 3 Chapter of St. Luke, vers. 16. to *Baptize with Water, with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire*, or as it is in the first Edition, *with Water, by the Holy Ghost, and by Fire*, but to *Baptize in Water, in the Holy Ghost, and in Fire*.

If he had strictly follow'd the ancient *Latine* Interpreter; he would not have translated in the 26 Chap. of St. Matthew, vers. 28. *for this is my Blood*, it being read in the Vulgar, *hic est enim sanguis meus*; and not *hoc est enim sanguis meus*. It ought to be render'd, *it is my Blood*, as well in this place, as in St. Mark, Chap. 14. vers. 24. We should also interpret these other Words, *hoc est enim Corpus meum*; thus, *it is my Body*, if we intend to adhere to the ancient *Latine* Edition; whereas, the most part of Interpreters, Translate with the Protestants, *this is my Body*. These later undertake to prove thereby, that the Pronoun *this*, being a *Relative*, refers to the word *Bread*, which precedes it; but *Erasmus*, and *Casalius*, who were very able Grammarians, have render'd it, in these two places, according to our Translation, *hic est sanguis meus*; furthermore, it has been above observ'd, that Dr. John Boys hath vindicated the ancient *Latine* Interpreter, in that place. This learned Protestant has also proved, by some Examples, that the Pronoun *isto* which is ambiguous, in the Greek, might be a demonstrative.

I should have nothing to object against his Translation, in the first Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*, verse 4. *who was predestinated*, conformably to the Vulgar, where we find *prædestinatus*, were it not that he hath added a Note, which shews that he is not exact as to this

matter.

matter. *The most ancient Copies* (says he, and probably the *Apostolical* of the *Latine Interpreter* had προειδωτο, *predestinated*: But the difficulty of this word, with respect to the Son of God, hath easily caus'd it to be changed into δεδιωτο which the *Grecians* have explained by declared, although it rather signifies defined, and determined.

He had no *Greek Copies*, in which he read προειδωτο, and nevertheless, he avouches, that it was the reading of the most ancient; he also conjectures, that it was thus written in that which he calls, the *Apostolick*. Indeed, there is one of the Library of Card. *Barbarini*, cited in the *Greek New Testament*, Printed at *Oxford*, wherein προειδωτο is express'd. But we have elsewhere observ'd, that the Compound word *predestinatus*, in the ancient *Latine Version*, is the same thing, as the simple *destinatus*, as *præordinatus* is likewise therein used, in the very same sense, as *ordinatus*: Therefore it cannot be affirm'd, that there hath been any Alteration, in this place, in the *Greek Original*.

Father *Amelote* (intending to deliver, to the People, the *Latine Edition* of the *New Testament*, turn'd into *French*) might Translate, in Chap. 15. Verse 3. of the 1 Epistle to the *Corinthians*, who have believ'd in his coming; but the Note which he subjoins, in this place, does not seem, to me, to be Judicious. We read (says he) in all the *Greek*, and ancient *Latine Copies*, only οι το Χριστῷ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ. The Edition of the *Latine Author*, is nevertheless more clear and more plain, and the *Apostolical Copy*, which was made use of by him, was manifestly more correct. In like manner, the *Marquess de Velez* has found in the *Mss.* of *Spain*, according to the reading of this *Author*, οι ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ ὄντες.

He might well justify the Expression of the *Vulgar*, by that of the *Mss.* of the *Marquess de Velez*; but he ought not (in my opinion) to conclude from thence, that it was the true reading of the *Apostolical Copy*, since it differs from all the other *Greek Copies*, even the most ancient, and from the *Vulgar*, that was read before the time of *St. Jerom*: For *crediderunt*, and the last *qui*, are not contain'd in the *Latine*, of the ancient Manuscript of *St. Germain des Prez*; and it is probable, that these words, *qui crediderunt*, have been added, to render the Construction of this Passage more clear, by reason, that it seem'd to be somewhat intricate. The same thing might be done in the *Greek*, cited by the *Marquess de Velez*. However, we ought not to imagine, on this account, that the *Latine Interpreter* had a Copy of the like Nature.

This Father had reason to repeat in his first Edition of the *New Testament*, the word *peace*, in Chap. 2. of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, Verse 17. because this same word is likewise twice express'd, in the *Vulgar*, which he translated; neither can it be taken ill that he has confirm'd this reading, by the most ancient *Greek Copies*, that are at present in our Possession; but, in regard, that he does it only, with a design, to diminish the Authority of the other Copies, which are not
so

so ancient, we may reflect, a little, on what has been observ'd, in the first part of this work, concerning the Copy of *Clermont*, and that of *St. Germain des Prez*, which are these ancient and venerable Mss. generally oppos'd by him to this *Greek*, that he calls *Vulgar*. It has been therein evidently demonstrated, that they are not more exact, by reason of their being more ancient; and that they do not certainly represent the Primitive Original of *St. Paul*. The same thing may be affirm'd, touching the Manuscript of *Cambridge*, which is no less ancient, and nevertheless, is very far from the true Original of the Gospel, and of the Acts of the Apostles.

All this apparently shews, that F. *Amelote* is not well vers'd in the Critical Examination of the *Greek* Mss. of the New Testament; for it is not true that these most ancient Mss. are the only *True, Pure, Faithful, and Apostolical* Copies; nevertheless, the greatest part of his Remarks, relating to his Translation, depends thereon. *It is a wonderful thing, and full of Consolation* (says this Father) *to see that there is no considerable place, where the Vulgar Greek departs from the Latine, that is not illustrated by some of these venerable and august Greek Mss. which the more ancient they are, the more they are conformable, not to the Greek Text, which is in use at this day, but to our Latine Version.* This Experience evidently proves, that when the *Greek*, is different from the *Latine*, our Interpreter hath read otherwise, in his *Greek* Originals, than we now do in the *Vulgar Greek*. P. Amel.
Pref. de
son N. T.

If he had stop't here, and had not concluded, from this Experience, that the *Greek* Text, styl'd by him, the *Vulgar*, is corrupted, in all these passages, where it does not agree with these venerable and august Mss. to which, the ancient *Latine* Edition is conformable, he would have avouch'd nothing contrary to good Sense. But he does not consider that *St. Jerom* hath reform'd this ancient Edition, in many places, where it was consonant to these venerable Mss.

I shall alledge no other instance, to convince him, that he has not had a clear and distinct Idea of the Qualifications of the *Greek* Mss. concerning which he treats, than that which is produc'd by him in this place. We now read, in the *Vulgar*, *Matth. 5. vers. 22. whosoever is angry with his Brother, and in the present Greek Text, whosoever is angry with his Brother, without a cause.* The word *χωρίς*, without a cause, which is not express'd in the *Latine*, is added in the *Greek*; whereupon, Father *Amelote*, makes this Reflection. *In an Affair of so great Importance, how careful ought we to be in searching out the meaning of Jesus Christ? If we consult this pretended Original that is now in use, a liberty of Indignation may justly be allow'd to all those that shall judge, that they have reason to be offended thereby. For the admirable, and altogether Divine Precept of the love of our Enemies, is modified, by a certain Person, who has made himself the Counsellor of God, and who, by his humane sense and authority, hath written, in this place, the word *χωρίς*.* Ibid.

It is to be admir'd that this Father should attribute the Title of the pretended Original which is now in use, to the Greek Text wherein this Reading is found, under colour that it is extant in the present Greek: He acknowledges that it is in some Manuscripts which are above twelve hundred years old; he might also affirm, That the Antiquity of thirteen or fourteen hundred years, might well be ascrib'd to it, since it is express'd in the Works of St. Irenæus, and in those of divers other Fathers of the Primitive Ages. The Western Churches have not read otherwise in their Vulgar Edition, before the time of St. Jerome, who is the first that hath Corrected it in this place.

He has not consider'd that his Invectives fall on the whole course of Antiquity, and even on the Eastern Churches, which never follow'd the Reformation of St. Jerome. The Syriack Interpreter reads in his Version the same word *ἐκν* conformably to all the Greek Copies, excepting that of the Vatican, as has been elsewhere observ'd; and this hath made so strong an impression on the Mind of some Learned Criticks, that they have believ'd that the Ancient Reading *sine causa* ought to be re-establish'd in the Vulgar.

I have not departed far from this Opinion in the first part of my History; but after having made some Reflections on the qualifications of the most Ancient Greek Copies of the New Testament, which have been Revis'd, even in the Primitive Ages of the Church, I determin'd that this Passage might be one of those that were then Corrected; nevertheless I durst not avouch any thing, that I may not seem too easily to condemn the continual practice of Antiquity, and even that of all the Fathers, saving only two or three who are cited by F. Amelote.

It is true indeed, that St. Jerome grounds his Correction on the Authority of certain Ancient Greek Copies, and he is followed in this particular by St. Augustine: But these two Fathers shew at the same time, that it was then read in the Vulgar *sine causa*; and perhaps St. Augustine could not have alter'd his Opinion, if he had not read St. Jerome's Remark on this passage, wherein he attributes the Name of true Copies, to those that had not the word *ἐκν*. Who sees not (says F. Amelote,) that by this Character of true Copies, he manifestly condemns those that are extant at this day, in which this Addition is still retain'd?

However, St. Jerome meant nothing else by these words, but the Greek Copies which he consulted in the reforming of the Vulgar, and he calls them true, with respect to this Vulgar, which was very much alter'd: Moreover, his Judgment, which was grounded only on the ordinary Rules of the Critical Art, could not be Infallible. It might well be demanded of F. Amelote, What we ought to think concerning these August and Venerable MSS. written twelve and thirteen hundred Years agoe, which this Father has Corrected with so much liberty, by others that he believ'd to be more exact.

Let us once more give ear to Father *Amelote's* arguments, whose new discoveries are always admirable, none having hitherto perus'd so great a number of *Greek MSS.* To obtain (saies he) further certainty in so necessary a doctrine, I have consulted the most antient *MSS.* of the *Vatican*, and have found that the word *ἰκν* without a cause was not written therein. Moreover, I have examin'd the *Greek MSS.* that were us'd by the *Arabick Interpreter*, in the composing of his *Version*, and those of the *Ethiopian Interpreter*; but the word *ἰκν* was not express'd in either of them. Ibid.

Any one who reads these words would imagine that this Father had really in his possession the famous Manuscript of the *Vatican*, altho' he is on this account beholding to *Lucas Brugensis*, who hath observ'd this diversity of Reading in his Notes; but he discourseth thereof much more modestly; for he is content to declare that he hath made use of the *Greek Edition* of the New Testament, Published by *Warnerus*. Luc Brug. Not. in c. 5. Matth. v. 22.

As for the *Greek MSS.* of the *Arabick* and *Ethiopian Interpreter*, it has been already intimated that they are only imaginary. It is true indeed that *ἰκν* without a cause is not read in the *Arabick Version*, which was Printed at *Rome*, and Reprinted in the *Polyglott-Bibles* of *Paris* and *London*, with some alterations. But we have above shewn that this *Arabick Edition* hath been corrected in divers places according to the *Vulgar*: If Father *Amelote* had understood this Language, he would have consulted the entire *Arabick Edition* of the New Testament, set forth by *Erpenius*, where we find *ἰκν* which is the same thing as the word *ἰκν*. Lastly the *Ethiopian* is not so Authentick a piece, as that we may rely thereon, after the manner as it was first Printed at *Rome*, and afterwards in the two *Polyglotts*.

In a word, if this matter were to be decided by the Plurality, and even Antiquity of *MSS.* it is certain that all the Fathers, both *Grecians* and *Latines*, oppose the *Vulgar*, until the Reformation of *St. Jerom*, which was follow'd by *St. Augustin* and *Cassian*; altho' this last was the Disciple of *St. John Chrysostom*, and *F. Amelote* insists on his authority, as if the quality of a Disciple of *St. Chrysostom* were of any weight on this occasion; it cannot be denied that being come to reside at *Marseille*, he might make use of *St. Jerom's* Correction. Moreover not only *St. Chrysostom*, but *Origen* and all the other *Grecian Fathers* here read *ἰκν* in their Copies.

But after all, notwithstanding the almost universal consent of the *Greek* and *Latine Writers*, with respect to this place of *St. Matthew*, I have above observ'd the reason that may induce us to prefer the Reading found by *St. Jerom*, in the *Greek MSS.* which he calls *true Copies*, before that which is maintain'd by all the Antient Fathers. The judgment of this Learned Critick ought to oblige Father *Amelote*, readily to submit, as often as he opposes to the present *Greek Text*, these

()

Venerable and August Manuscripts above twelve and thirteen hundred years old.

He produces in his Preface another example, by which he endeavours to diminish the authority of the *Greek Text* that is now in use, and at the same time to advance that of this antient *Greek*, to which the *Vulgar* is conformable. This instance is taken from Chap. 8. of *St. Mark*, vers. 7. where he has Translated *they had also a few small fishes which he likewise blessed*, conformably to the *Vulgar* in which it is express'd, *ἐἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἐβλόησαν*; whereas in the present *Greek* we read only, *καὶ ἐβλόησαν*; and blessing, where the important word, *ipso* them (saies this Father) is eclipsed, and from whence the Ministers of Geneva take occasion to confound the benediction with the thanksgiving, as they have also done in the Eucharist, in *St. Matth. Chap. 26. vers. 26.* rendring in both these places the word *ἐβλόησαν* by giving of thanks. But if it were written in the Apostolick Original, he blessed them, that is to say, the Fishes, it is evident that this benediction was a different thing from a thanksgiving. Afterwards he exhibits two MSS. of Rome, and three of the Kings Library, wherein it is express'd *καὶ ἐβλόησας αὐτὰ* and blessing them, as also that of Alexandria, in which it is found according to the sense *καὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ἐβλόησας*. He adds that the Syriack, Arabick and Persian Interpreters have likewise read after the same manner.

If he had been content to shew by the authority of all these MSS. that the antient Interpreter of the *Latin Church*, made use of other *Greek Copies* different from those that are now extant throughout the whole World, and that the Ministers of Geneva had no reason to abandon his Version, under pretence that it was not conformable to the present *Greek*, there would have been nothing in this Remark but what is very solid. But able Criticks will never allow that he should conclude from thence, that the Reading which is establish'd by this Interpreter is the true and Apostolical, and that the other is absolutely false.

Moreover he commences an ill grounded Process against the Divines of Geneva, on the account that they have translated in some places the Verb *ἐβλόησαν* which signifies to bless, by to give thanks. He ought to have observ'd in comparing the *Greek MSS.* of the New Testament; that there is nothing more usual than the changing of these two words *ἐβλόησαν* to bless and *εὐχαρισῶσαν* to give thanks. And indeed they denote the very same thing in those places, according to the custom of the Jews; for that which they call thanksgiving, is a real Prayer or Benediction that is made over the Bread.

Therefore he has not well render'd in another place these words of our *Vulgar*, *quid blasphemor pro eo quod gratias ago?* after this manner, *why should I be blam'd for making use of those goods, for which I testify my acknowledgiment to the Author thereof?* It is written in the *Greek* *καὶ ἐγὼ εὐχαρισῶ* for which I give thanks. Now this thanksgiving (among the Jews) was a real Prayer or Benediction.

I know

I know that Father *Coton* has reprov'd *Calvin*, *Beza* and other Ministers of *Geneva* on the same account, before *F. Amelote*. But this Jesuit, who had attain'd to a profound skill in matters of Controversie, had not sufficiently applied himself to the study of the Critical Science. It is certain that in the stile of the New Testament, the Verbs *εὐλογεῖν* and *εὐχαριστεῖν* are frequently taken one for the other, and this is the reason that there is so great a diversity thereupon in the MSS Copies.

Therefore the Ministers of *Geneva* might well make this Remark without wresting the true sense of the H. Scripture. But when they found *εὐλογεῖν* in their *Greek* Copy, they ought to Translate *to bless*, and not *to give thanks*, although in the main it is the same thing as to the sense; for a judicious Translator ought to follow as far as possible the Grammatical sense. It is sufficient that the Verb *εὐλογεῖν* signifies simply *to bless*, in some places to justify the interpreting thereof, always after this manner.

It is an affectation worthy of blame in those of *Geneva*, to Translate in Chap. 8. of *St. Mark* vers. 7. *after he had given thanks*, having read in the *Greek* *εὐλογήσας*, which Literally signifies *after having blessed*, but they have inserted this last interpretation in the Margent; and they seem to have made this alteration only because the word *to bless* is generally us'd in the Church from whence they have departed. The Ministers of *Geneva* have studiously remov'd from their Versions, as much as possibly they could, those expressions which seem to confirm the customs of the Church of *Rome*.

This is the only prevarication that can here be imputed to them, whereas *F. Amelote* objects that the Benediction mention'd in this passage of *St. Mark* is manifestly a different thing from a thanksgiving. He has not consider'd that we read in this same place, in the *Cambridge* Copy, which is one of these *August* and *Venerable* MSS. (to which the *Vulgar* is often conformable *εὐχαριστήσας* *having given thanks*, as it is printed in the Version of *Geneva*.

As for the other accusation, which is grounded on Chap. 26 of *St. Matth.* vers. 26. where they have Translated, *after they had given thanks*; although they read *εὐλογήσας* in the *Greek*, they might nevertheless replv, that it is written in the same place, in many authentick MSS. *εὐχαριστήσας*. Indeed *Beza* makes this Remark, tho' he hath render'd, *cum benedixisset*. In septem, (saies he) *codicibus vetustis legitur εὐχαριστήσας*, gratiis actis, eodem sensu. Moreover he proves, that in the following verse, where *St. Matthew* speaks of the consecration of the Cup, this Evangelist has inserted *εὐχαριστήσας*, which Father *Amelote* hath Interpreted by, *after he had given thanks*, and which is consequently the same thing as *εὐλογήσας* *having blessed*.

The same thing may be avouch'd concerning the passage of *St. Mark* which is now in debate; for in vers. 6. of chap. 8. where mention is

()

made of the benediction of the Bread; this Evangelist useth the Verb, *ευχαριστας* having given thanks. As for the important word *ipsos*, them, which (according to his opinion) is eclips'd in the present Greek Text; there is no reason to insist so much on this Pronoun, and to object to the Ministers of Geneva, that they have taken an occasion from thence, to confound the Benediction, with the Thanksgiving. If they have not express'd it in their Translation; it is because it was not written in their Greek Copy; and if it be found in some old Mss. and in some ancient Versions; it ought not to be insert'd from thence, that these last Copies only represent the true Original of St. Mark. On the contrary, the most simple Readings are usually the most genuine; and therefore it might happen, that this Pronoun was, afterward, added to render the Expression more clear; but whether it is read or not, the sense is always the same.

I could have wish'd that F. Amelote had not engag'd himself in so mean a Controversie, under colour of vindicating the ancient Latine Version, which does not stand in need of being maintain'd by such sort of disputes. It were sufficient to prove, as he has done, that the Originals of our Latine Author, and those of St. Jerom, were different from the Vulgar Greek. There is none that does not herein approve his judgment and learning; and it were yet more commendable, if he had retain'd in his Translation a perfect uniformity, in exactly following the Vulgar, as he propos'd to himself in the Title of his Book, and in the Preface. It is true indeed, that having perceiv'd this defect, he has reform'd many things, according to this Idea, in the other Editions of his New Testament, where he departs less from the Vulgar, than in the first; but, after all, there still remain many places that stand in need of Correction.

Another defect, which is predominant, throughout the Version of this Father, is, that he has insert'd divers words, which are not written in the Text, that he translated; neither does he distinguish them with an *Italic* Character. There is scarcely a Chapter, in which we do not find an instance thereof; especially, in the Epistles of St. Paul, where he often makes use of a *Periphrasis*, or Circumlocution, which it was difficult for him to avoid, in prosecuting his design, to exhibit a Version that should come nearer to the propriety of the French Tongue, and consequently more Literal, than those that were formerly publish'd.

Moreover in regard that he was not so well vers'd in Critical Disquisitions, as in Divinity; he frequently departs from the Grammatical Sense (which ought to be the Foundation of an exact Version) to follow his Theological Notions. Therefore, in Chap. 1. of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Verse 3. he has render'd these Words of the Vulgar, *Figura substantia ejus*; after this manner, *the impression of his person*. He would have done better, if he had written, in his Version, as it is express'd, in those of Port-Royal, and of Monsieur Godeau, *the character of his Substance*.

ſtance. We read, likewise, in the *Spanish Translation*, of *Cyprian de Valera*, according to the ſame ſenſe, *la imagen de ſubſtancia*, the image of his ſubſtance. It were much more judicious to inſert the word *perſon* in a Marginal Note, rather than in the Text of the Verſion, as being the Theological Senſe; at leaſt, it is ſo underſtood by Divines.

Father *Amelote* ſeems to have imitated *Beza*, in this particular, who hastranſlated *character perſonæ illius*, the character of his perſon. It is likewise Printed, in the Verſion of *Geneva*, *la marque engravée de la perſonne d' iceluy*; the engrav'd mark of his perſon; the ancient Edition of *Antwerp*, *la figure de ſubſiſtence d' iceluy*, the figure of his ſubſiſtence; and in the *Italian* of *Diodati*, *il carattere della ſoſſiſtenza d' eſſo*, the character of his ſubſiſtence. But *Erasmus*, and *Caſtali*, have adher'd to the ancient *Latine* Verſion; the former having render'd *expreſſa imago ſubſtantie illius*, the expreſs image of his ſubſtance; and the other, *forma expreſſa ſubſtantie*, the expreſs form of his ſubſtance: We read alſo, in like manner, in the *Syriack* *ܐܠܘܗܐ ܝܫܘܥ*, the image of his ſubſtance, or of his eſſence; and in the *Louvain Translation*, *la figure de la ſubſtance d' iceluy* the figure of his ſubſtance.

Moreover, it were more expedient (in my opinion) to Tranſlate this Expreſſion, in the *Epistle to the Philippians*, *qui cum in formâ Dei eſſet*, thus, *who having the form of God*, than, after this manner, *who Philip: profeſſing the Divine Nature*. I grant, that this is the true ſenſe of *St. c. 2. v. 6: Paul's* words; but, forasmuch, as it may be diſputed, and it is actually call'd in queſtion by ſome, eſpecially, the *Unitarians*; he ought to have inſerted it in a Note.

Father *Amelote* has, likewise, had more regard to his Theological Ideas, in Chap. 8. of *St. John's Gospel*, Verſe 25. than to the genuine ſenſe of theſe words, *principium qui & loquor vobis*, which are read in the *Vulgar*, when he hath render'd them thus; *I am the beginning, who alſo ſpeak unto you*: The word *principium* is expreſs'd in the Accuſative Caſe, in the *Greek Original*, and therefore it is apparently to depart from the true ſenſe to interpret, *I am the beginning*; but, becauſe *St. Auguſtin*, and ſome other *Latine Fathers* have authoriz'd it; he determin'd, that he ought to reject the Grammatical ſenſe, in this place, in imitation of theſe Fathers.

He adds likewise, that it might well happen, that the ancient *Latine Interpreter* read otherwiſe in his *Greek Copy*. After all (ſays he) the *Latine Interpreter* ought not to be eaſily abandon'd, being follow'd by the moſt learned of the Fathers: Who knows, whether in his more ancient *Greek Copy*, it were not written *ἡ ἀρχὴ*? But the Fathers, cited by him, have reſolv'd this difficulty, by acknowledging, that it was expreſs'd *ἡ ἀρχὴ* in the *Greek Text*; and there is no variation thereupon, in the *Greek Copies*. They have rather produc'd a Theological explication of this paſſage, than a Literal interpretation. The ancient *Latine Interpreter*, who has tranſlated the *Greek*, word for word, has inſerted

()
: *principium*, in the Accusative case, as it is in the *Greek*, and there is not the least appearance that he hath read otherwise.

It were easie to produce a great number of Examples, to prove that F. *Amelote* is far from being exact, in his Version of the New Testament; but this would be too tedious, we need only to observe, that he hath departed too far from the Letter of his Text. He has indeed endeavour'd to prevent this Objection, by declaring that he hath, in this particular, imitated St. *Jerom's* Translation of the Old Testament; but if he intended to follow the Example of this learned Father, he ought rather to imitate him, in the ancient Version of the New Testament, which he hath revis'd, than in that of the Old, where he takes a little more liberty. But it having been generally approv'd by all the Western Churches; this alone is sufficient to cause it to be prefer'd before all others.

The same thing cannot be affirm'd, with respect to the modern Translators, who ought to apply themselves (as much as is possible) to render the Text, which they interpret, faithfully, and even according to the very Letter; otherwise, they will incur the suspicion (especially if they are addicted to any particular Sect, or Party) of having rather publish'd their own private notions, than exhibited the Word of God: But St. *Jerom* having liv'd a long while before our disputes concerning Religion, cannot be suspected by any party. In a word, we ought not to rely on the Example of this Father, in composing a too licentious Version of the New Testament.

It may indeed be allow'd, to consider the difference of the Languages, since our Customs and Expressions do not agree with those of the ancient People of the Eastern Countries; on this account, I readily grant, with F. *Amelote*, that it is not requisite to make use of the Conjunction, *and*, in all the places, where it is found in the New Testament, by reason that such a Repetition would be offensive, as well as these other Particles, *behold*, *then*, *now*, *because*, &c. I am also persuaded that others may be substituted, in their room; and this is even necessary to be done sometimes, to form a more clear sense.

But this must not be attempted, without very great precautions; for it frequently happens, that a Translator leaves out these Particles, in his Version, or changes them for others, to render his style more agreeable, without considering that he thereby alters the sense of his Text: There are, for Example, some places where the *Greek* Particle *ετι*, represented by the *Latine quia*, or *quod*, is not causal; and there are others in which it is affirmative, as the *ו* of the *Hebrews* is in like manner sometimes affirmative: At least, if a Translator have not an exact knowledge of these different Acceptions, it is impossible that he should succeed well in the Interpretation of such Particles.

The same qualifications may be attributed to the Particle *ou*, which often answering in the New Testament, to the *vau* of the *Hebrews*, may be taken in as many different Senses, as that Particle. I have reason to doubt whether F. *Amelote*, and many others, who have undertaken to Translate the New Testament into the *French Tongue*, were capable of apprehending these Remarks.

C H A P. XXXIV.

Of the Version of M. Godeau, Bishop of Vence.

I Have often doubted whether we ought to reckon among the *French Versions* of the New Testament, that of M. *Godeau*, Bishop of *Vence*, Printed at *Paris*, in the Year 1668. neither indeed does it bear this Title, but that of an explain'd *Version*. *I have compos'd*, says he, *neither a Version, nor a Paraphrase, but something that partakes of both.* He affirms, That to make a literal *Version* of the New Testament, is to be involv'd in a necessity of being little intelligible in many places, and to make a *Paraphrase*, is to expatiate too far, and in some manner to weaken the Sense of the Text, by endeavouring to illustrate it.

This Bishop pretends to have found out a mean between these two Methods, by exhibiting a *pure and exact Version*, when nothing occurs that is difficult, or that requires an *Explication*. But in those places, says he, *where I meet with any thing that is obscure, or that stands in need of a Connexion to be more easily understood, I add certain words, which I have caus'd to be included in a Parenthesis, and to be Printed with an Italic Character, whereby, in my Opinion, the difficulty is resolv'd, without interrupting the coherence of the Text.*

There is nothing but what is commendable in this design, and this precaution is very useful in the Translating of the Sacred Books, where it is to be fear'd, lest a Translator should obtrude his own Notions, instead of the Word of God. But whatsoever care M. *Godeau* may have taken to avoid falling into this Error, it might be easily prov'd, by a very great number of Examples, that he hath added divers words in his *Version*, that are not contain'd in the Text which he has Translated. He hath often extended, or limited, the Sense, by this means, without including his Additions in a *Parenthesis*, or distinguishing them by an *Italic Letter*.

However, he declares in a small Advertisement, prefix'd to a large Catalogue of Passages, which he propounds to be Corrected in his Translation of the New Testament, *that he hath remark'd all the places, where Words have been inserted in the Text, and in the Roman Letter, that ought to be set in the Italick, and in a Parenthesis.* But we need only to peruse his Version of the Epistles of *St. Paul*, to perceive that he has added several words that do not appertain to this Holy Apostle, and these Words are likewise written in the *Roman* Character, after the same manner as the rest of his Translations; which it was difficult for him to avoid, according to the method that he has observ'd. Moreover, he frequently adheres to the Letter of the *Latine* Edition, excepting that he follows the *Greek* in some places, therefore he does not shew a sufficient Uniformity in his Translation; neither is he accustomed intirely to cleave unto the Vulgar, though he protests to depart from it but very rarely. *I have almost always follow'd, says he; the Vulgar Translation, which is as Authentick, and as Faithful, as the Greek Text.*

M. Arn. Mr. Arnould assures us, That this Version differs only from that of *Mons.* in this, That there are fewer Notes in the latter, and they are subjoin'd at the bottom of the Page; whereas there are more in the other express'd only in a different Character, and comprehended in certain Parenthesis. Indeed these two Versions very much resemble one another; that of *Mr. Godeau* is nevertheless generally more simple, and is not so polite and elegant as that of *Mons*; however it is no less Faithful. As for the Stile that I have made use of, (says this Bishop) I have endeavoured to make it French, but I have not been so scrupulous in my Words, as not at the same time to take as much care as possibly I could, in retaining the Character of the Original, which is so Venerable and Sacred: and even when I might easily have Translated many Passages otherwise than I have done, especially in the Apostolical Epistles, I chose rather to appear to be Faithful, in rendering the expressions of *St. Paul*, and the other Apostles, than exact in observing the Elegancy of our Language.

There is nothing in this but what is very good Sense, and it were to be wish'd, that all the Translators had follow'd this Rule: But the Application made by *Mr. Godeau*, in the same place, is somewhat uncouth; he declares, That this is the reason that he has always retain'd the manner of Invocating God in the singular Number, and not in the Plural, and to say unto him, *toy thou*, rather than *vous, you*. As being a Poet, he was accustomed to this sort of Expressions, which are not easily allow'd in Prose in the *French* Tongue; nevertheless, he believ'd that he shew'd more Reverence to the Majesty of God, in making his Addresses to him thus, than in speaking after the manner of Men.

But

But I am persuaded that there are very few of his Opinion, for the Matter here in debate, hath no relation to the Original Language of the New Testament, nor to that of the Ancient Versions, wherein this Civility is not express'd, as he hath observ'd; it is sufficient that it was generally admitted by the *French*, who esteem it as an indecent thing to speak to God by *Thou*. He adds, That there is a farther uncomeliness, *that God should speak to the Devil by you*; but if he imagin'd that there was any irregularity in this, he was at liberty to introduce God speaking to the Devil by *thou*; whereas in making use of the expression *thou* every where alike, he places God and the Devil in the same rank, affording as much respect to one, as to the other.

Furthermore, He gives us to understand in the same place, *That he has not avoided certain Terms, as those of Prepuce the Fore-skin, and Semence, Seed, believing that he ought not to be more nice than St. Paul, who certainly took all the care that was requisite, not to offend the Modesty of the Faithful to whom he wrote.* However, there are some Persons to whom these words are offensive, wherefore we should rather have regard in this case, to the custom of things, than to the things themselves; forasmuch as *St. Paul* has made use of divers words, which it would be convenient to mollify in our Language.

Mr. Godeau has prefix'd at the beginning of his Work, an Epistle dedicated to all the Faithful, wherein he recommends to them the reading of the New Testament, which they *ought to study day and night*. He dissuades them at the same time, from the Doctrine of the Modern Casuists, whom he decries with all his might: He discourses after this manner in speaking of the New Testament, with reference to those Casuists; *It will satisfy your doubts with certain Resolutions, and will afford to your Consciences a true rest; in a word, it will be an admirable Casuist to regulate your Life.* The Christians, during many Ages, never had any other, and they were in so good a condition, that their Manners were as Holy as their Faith — At present, the Christians have infinitely departed from this Purity; the number of Doctors is multiplied, but wholesome Doctrine is almost entirely abolish'd; Cases of Conscience have been exactly discuss'd, every thing has been examin'd, every thing has been regulated, but Conscience is lost.

*Mr. God.
Epist. to the
Faithful.*

It is easie to judge that he intended thereby to reflect on the Jesuists; it is known to the World that *F. Vavasor* has publish'd certain Reasons which induc'd him to doubt whether *M. Godeau* were a Poet, *utrum Godellus sit Poeta*. Whereupon this Bishop could not forbear expressing his resentment, in the Preface inserted at the beginning of his Paraphrase on the *Psalms*, where he speaks to this effect: *The Censorious and the Envious, not only call in question whether I am a Poet, or not, but undertake Magisterially to pronounce, That I do not understand the first Elements of Grammar.* Let them banish me from the Schools of Philosophy and Divinity; let them find out in my Version of the *Psalms*, as many Errors

as they shall think fit, nevertheless, I shall not be disturb'd by these Practices.

He endeavours to retaliate these Aspersions cast on him by the Jesuits, and even sufficiently insinuates in the Preface to his New Testament, That he Translated it only with a design to cause the Doctrine of Jesus Christ to be propagated among Christians. *I must declare*, says he, *That the principal reason that oblig'd me, above Ten Years ago, to undertake this Version, was the Ignorance of the Gospel, and the corruption of its Maxims, which I perceiv'd to be predominant in the mind of the Professors of Christianity.* He complains, that the most part of Christians, at this day, consult only modern Authors, who have introduced a sort of Scepticism into Religion, whereby the Affirmative may be as easily maintained as the Negative.

Not that French Versions, of the New Testament, were then wanting; but Mr. Godeau apparently believ'd, that his which was composed by a new Method, and even in more elegant French, than the preceding, would over-run all the other: Nevertheless, we do not find that it has obtain'd so great repute in the World; and the Sale thereof was much obstructed by F. Amelote's Translation, and that of Mons, which were publish'd a little before it; although the Gentlemen of Port-Royal, very much approv'd the Epistle and Preface, that we have even now mention'd; for in regard that this Bishop maintain'd the same Opinions, with them, and was no Friend to the Jesuits, they fail'd not to oppose it to all those that attack'd their Version. *It is for the publick good* (says one of their Apologists) *that my Lord Bishop of Vence, hath (so successfully) taken pains, in confuting, with so great vigour and prudence, the Enemies of the Truth, who endeavour to take away, from the Sons of the Church, the Testament of their Father; and who (after having continually disputed against this Divine Testament, with the sophistical ratiocinations of a corrupted Doctrine) go about to prevent those Laws, from being known, which they have so often violated.*

Ans. to the
2d. Let. of
a Prot. Div.
concern. the
Transl. of
Mons.

It cannot be denied that M. Godeau was mov'd by an extraordinary Piety, and had a very great desire of being serviceable to the Publick, but it may be doubted without doing any injury to his reputation, whether he were endued with all those qualifications that are requisite for the composing of a good Translation of the New Testament. And indeed we need not to search very far into his Work to find sufficient proof thereof; for he is not exact even in the very first words of his Version. He renders these words, *Liber Generationis*, thus, *The Book of the Genealogy*. If he intended to express them literally, he ought to have translated, *The Book of the Generation*; and in adhering only to the sense, they should be interpreted *The Genealogy*. But forasmuch as he has acknowledg'd himself not to be a Grammarian, it were needless to insist on these sort of niceties, whereof nevertheless they ought not to be ignorant, who undertake to Translate the Holy Scriptures.

We

We have reason to wish that there were a more clear connexion between the Text of his Version, and his Additions, or Explications. However, he assures us in his Preface, that *he has taken them all from the works of the Fathers, or from the most approv'd modern Commentaries*, and that he avouches nothing on his own authority; but this ought not to hinder him from rendering his Translation conformable to his Additions. He Translates for example, these words in Chap. 8. of St. John's Gospel, vers. 25. *principium qui & loquor vobis*, after this manner *I am the beginning* (of all things) *who speak unto you*; and adds afterward (*I am the same person that I said unto you from the beginning*). In this passage τὸν ἀρχὴν in the Accusative case, ought to be taken adverbially, and as if St. John had said ἐξ ἀρχῆς a principio. If this be true, he should not Translate in the Text of his Version, *I am the beginning*, &c. It were much more expedient to insert what he has added in the form of an explication, but since he has only collected that which he had read in different Commentaries, he is not always conformable to himself.

Besides that he does not follow the Vulgar in Chap. 1. of the Epistle to the Romans; vers. 4. neither hath he explain'd this passage according to the Letter in rendring it thus, *who was declared* (caus'd himself to be acknowledg'd as) *the Son of God by vertue*, (the power of his Miracles) *by the fulness of the Holy Ghost* (who dwelt in him, and which he gave to his Church) *and by his resurrection from the dead*. These words, *secundum spiritum sanctificationis*, do not literally signify *by the fulness of the Holy Ghost*.

In the 9th vers. of the same Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, he has Translated these words *cui servo in spiritu*, after this manner, *whom I serve in my spirit* (with an interior worship). If he had added nothing in different Characters to limit his interpretation, it would have been literal; for there is no mention made in this place of an *interior worship*, but simply of the Ministry of St. Paul, who was an Apostle of Jesus Christ. This same defect abounds in many other places of M. Godeau's Translation, who under colour of publishing an *explain'd Version* of the New Testament, has substituted the private explications of Commentators in the room of the words of the Holy Ghost.

It is true indeed that he generally marks this kind of illustrations in the Italick Letter, to distinguish them from his Text; however, this does not prevent the limitation of the sense, and the restraining of it sometimes to false Glosses, or at least to those that are very uncertain. As for instance, where it is related in Chap. 27. of St. Matth. vers. 45. that from Noon untill Three of the Clock, darkness was spread over the whole Earth, *tenebra facta sunt super universam terram*, he adds by way of explication, *there was a general Eclipse of the Sun, which continued three hours, and happen'd the Moon being full, contrary to the*
course

course of Nature. But it is much more probable that this darkness was no where but in the Land of *Judea*, which is call'd according to the usual stile of the Scriptures, *the whole Earth*. Moreover we find no mention of any Eclipse in this place, much less of one that was general.

This Translator hath sometimes observ'd the various Readings of the *Greek Text*, but he has not always put them in *Italick*, as he was oblig'd to do, since he Translated the *Latin* of the *Vulgar*, and not the *Greek*: Thus he hath added in *Chap. 6.* of *St. Matth.* vers. 13. at the end of the Lords Prayer these words in the *Roman* letter, as the rest of the *Text*, *For thine is the Kingdom, and the Power and the Glory, for ever and ever.* Afterwards he makes this remark; *These words are express'd in the Greek Text, but not in the Version.*

This being granted, they ought to be printed in the *Italick*, and not in the *Roman* Character: But he apparently believ'd that they belong'd to the Original, and that therefore he ought not to retrench them, altho' they were not contain'd in the *Vulgar*. However, they that have attain'd to never so little skill in the Art of *Critick*, will be apt to determine that it is a *Gloss*, which hath been added afterward in the *Greek Text*. We have given a sufficient account of *M. Godeau's* explain'd Version, let us now proceed to examin the Translation of the *Port Royal*, which hath been so much talkt of in the World.

C H A P. XXXV.

Of the Version of the New Testament Printed at Mons. An Examination of the Second Part of the Preface, in which the Gentlemen of Port-Royal justify their Method.

IF we may give credit to the Writers of Apologies, on behalf of the Translation of the New Testament Printed at Mons: *This Work* Ab. & null. l'ord. de M. l' Arch. de Par. *hath obtain'd every where such Repute, that perhaps no Book that has been publish'd for many ages, ever met with greater applause.* And therefore it would seem to be a piece of rashness to refuse to subscribe to so universal an approbation: But forasmuch as able Criticks do not usually judge of Books according to the report that is spread abroad concerning them, and otherwise, in regard that the Gentlemen of Port-Royal cannot expect to be believ'd altogether on the testimony that they give of themselves, it is requisite to examine in particular, whether this approbation be well grounded or not.

We may observe that when *Martin Luther* in the last age published a Translation of the Bible in the *German* Tongue, it was forthwith highly esteem'd by the most part of the Northern People, and much admir'd by them, on the account of the clearness and elegancy of the expressions; nay, it is even at this day in great repute among the whole *Lutheran* party. But they who were expert in Critical Disquisitions, relating to the Sacred Books, soon perceiv'd that this Version did not deserve those extraordinary commendations that were every where bestowed on it, since the Author thereof has made use of a method which is subject to illusion.

Forasmuch as the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have follow'd the very same method in their Version of the New Testament, it has admitted almost the same defects as that of *Luther*. And indeed, if we compare the Reasons alledg'd by the Protestants of *Germany*, to justify their Patrons Bible, with the Vindications that these Gentlemen have Publish'd to maintain their Translation, there will appear so perfect a resemblance between them, that it might be justly believ'd, that the Authors of both those Works have proceeded on the very same Principles. To treat of every thing in its order, I shall hereafter discourse concerning *Luther's* Translation, when I shall come in due course to the examination of the *German* Versions.

I know that it has been objected to the Translators of *Mons*, that their Version confirms in many places the innovations of the Hereticks. But

M m in

in regard that I here profess to follow the ordinary Rules prescrib'd to me by the Critical Science, and not to act the part, either of a Divine, or a Decider of Controversies, it ought not to be expected that I should find out any Heresies in this Version. It may well happen that it is not exempt from Errors, to which those persons are usually obnoxious, who have engag'd themselves in any Sect or Party; and that the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have introduc'd the Holy Ghost, speaking according to their Prejudicate Notions. But I do not pretend to condemn them only on this account, that they seem to be suspected by many. To do them justice, it is necessary to examine their Work in particular. I shall begin with the Title of the Book, and the Second Part of their Preface, which may rather be taken for an Apology.

Printed at
Mons in
1667.

The Title of the Version of *Port-Royal* is express'd in these terms. *The New Testament of our Lord JESUS CHRIST Translated into French, according to the vulgar Edition; together with the variations of the Greek Text.* There is none that would not soon be apt to believe in reading this Title, that the Interpreter has really Translated the New Testament from the Vulgar Edition, and that he hath mark'd the places in which it differs from the *Greek*; nevertheless, we find that he follows the *Latin* for a while: At another time the *Greek*, and sometimes neither of them. It is true indeed, that he adheres much more to the Vulgar than to the *Greek*: But if the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* were exact, their Translation would have been conformable to the Title prefixed at the beginning thereof, and for this reason they ought not to abandon the *Latin* Interpreter in the Text of their Work. If they intended to observe the variations of the *Greek*, they ought to insert them in the Margin, or at the bottom of the pages; whereas they are found in divers places in the Text, whereof they even sometimes constitute a part, and the Vulgar is exhibited in some of those passages in the form of a Note. Moreover, can it be affirmed by them, that they have Translated the New Testament, *according to the Vulgar Edition, with the variations of the Greek Text.* Since they have produc'd very few of these variations of the *Greek*, and even those that are of the least importance? Let us proceed to the Preface.

They likewise give us to understand, that they were not ignorant of the Qualifications of a good Version of the Holy Scriptures, when they observe, that they who undertook to compose this Translation, understood that it was not sufficient to render Sense for Sense, but that the expressions must likewise be retain'd, by marking the proper Words, and by representing, (as much as is possible) their Energy, Extent, Order, Structure and Connexions.

This is indeed the *Idea* that ought to be form'd, whensoever we design to Translate the Sacred Books; and I do not believe that any person, endued with a sound Judgment, tho' of never so mean a capacity, can allow the Reasons which have induc'd the Translators of *Mons*, to depart

depart so far from this Method. They affirm, That *In adhering after this manner to the Letter, the Sense was sometimes so obstructed, that it seem'd to be un-intelligible; and that, by endeavouring to exhibit an indeterminate and uncertain Sense, the Readers were frequently left void of all Sense: Lastly, That, by this means, the Majesty of the Holy Scriptures was infinitely debased, in retaining nothing of that Venerable, and altogether Divine Air which it had in the Original Languages.*

But, in my Opinion, there is a certain Meen to be observ'd between these Interpreters; who, to adhere too strictly to the Letter, render themselves un-intelligible, and those that depart too far from it, as the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have done. If both these manners of Translating are defective, the first, which was follow'd by the most part of the *Jews*, and by the ancient *Latin* Interpreters, is much less dangerous than the second; and the defect of the first may be easily supplied by certain Illustrations: and when we are once accustom'd to this sort of Versions, the Holy Scriptures will become much more Intelligible; whereas we are apt, in following the second Method, to give out a Sense purely Human, which we afterwards cause to pass for the Word of God; and this is chiefly to be fear'd when the Translators are addicted to prejudicate Notions; for, under pretence of not having the Sense of a passage *uncertain and indeterminate*, they take the liberty to establish their own Opinions.

As for what is objected, That the first manner debases the Majesty of the Holy Scriptures; and that it preserves nothing of the Air which they had in the Original Tongues: I answer, That, on the contrary, in making use of the second Method, which departs from the expressions of the Original, nothing of this Air can be retain'd. It must be acknowledg'd, That the Gentleman of *Port-Royal* observe as much the Elegancy of the *French-Tongue*, in their Version of the *New-Testament*, as the *Lutherans* have done that of the *German* in their *High-Dutch-Bible*; but neither of them retain scarcely any thing of *this Venerable and altogether Divine Air*, that appears in the Holy Scriptures, in the Original Languages: And we do not find therein this simplicity of Style which is every where conspicuous throughout all the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles.

This is evident, even from the very first words of the Translation of *Mons*, where we read *the Genealogy of Jesus Christ*: and indeed these two *Latin Words*, *Liber Generationis*, which directly answer to two others expressed in the *Greek Text* of *St. Matthew*, signify *the Genealogy*; but an Interpreter, who is desirous to preserve this simple Air, which is peculiar to the Sacred Books in their Original Tongues, will chuse rather to Translate simply, the *Book of the Generation*; and, at the same time, to give notice in the Margent, That, in the Style of the Bible, that which was understood among the *Grecians*, by the term, γενεαλογία a *Genealogy*, is call'd βιβλα γενεας, *A Book of the Generation*; and that the Apostles took

took this Expression from the Greek Version of the Septuagint, who have thus interpreted the *Sepher Falsch* of the Hebrews. We shall, thus, by little and little, be acquainted with the Style of the Holy Scriptures, wherein all manner of Discourses, whether large or short, are call'd by the name of a *Book*.

These Gentlemen endeavor afterward to justify their Method by the example of St. *Jerom*, who is, as it were, the Model of Translators of the Holy Scriptures, since the Church hath so solemnly approv'd his Version. Now, this learned Father (say they) did not believe, That he was oblig'd to adhere to the Letter, as appears from his manner of Translating the Books of *Job*, and the Prophets. But if St. *Jerom's* Method were observ'd by the Interpreters of the Bible, they ought not to make use of his Version of the Writings of *Job* and the Prophets, which are very obscure Books, and of an extremely concise Style in the Hebrew. It were more expedient to follow the Ancient Version of the *New Testament*, corrected by him, which is very far from the Translation of *Montan*.

Furthermore, it ought to be considered, That that which has caus'd so great Authority to be attributed to St. *Jerom's* Version, is the general approbation of the *Western Churches* successively for many Ages; but this approbation cannot serve as a Rule to the Modern Translators, who are not allow'd to take too much liberty, under pretence of certain passages of the Bible, which this learned Father has translated, rather according to the sense than literally. This imitation (which may be attended with very ill Consequences) is to be avoided as culpable, especially at a time when the whole Christian World is divided into different Sects; who all endeavour to confirm their Opinions by Scripture, without having any regard to Tradition.

But, after all, Can the Translators of *Port-Royal* be compar'd to St. *Jerom*, who perfectly understood the Hebrew, Greek, and *Latin Tongue*? It is far more requisite in a Translation of the Sacred Books, in the vulgar Tongue, to adhere to the Letter as much as is possible, than to exhibit a too remote or distorted Sense by abandoning it; nevertheless, such care might be taken as to prevent these Translations from being intricate and un-intelligible, as those of the *Jews* most frequently are.

I cannot apprehend to what purpose these Translators do here insist on the example of St. *Augustin*, who (say they) has cited the words of St. *Jerom's* Version, even when it was not as yet in use among the Churches, to show the splendor and Majesty of the Holy Scriptures. It is sufficiently known how vigorously the new Translation of St. *Jerom* was opposed by this Pious Bishop, who could never be perswaded to approve it; nor is the Testimony of the same St. *Augustin*, afterwards alledg'd by the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, to justify the method that they pretend to have observ'd in their Version, more opportunely urg'd. They produced his Remark on the several Translations that were extant in his Time; He therein affirms, That this great number of Versions might be more

Service.

preferable than prejudicial to the understanding of the Holy Scriptures; and, forasmuch as some of them adhere to the Letter, and others to the Sense, he determines, That all ought to be consulted; nevertheless, after such a manner as the Ancient Version, call'd the *Italick*, should be chiefly prefer'd.

It might be objected, that it is more contrary to the assertions of the Translators of *France*, than this reflection of the *Italick*. To be answer'd thereof, we need only to compare the *Italick* Translation, as yet remaining in our Possession, with that of *Mant*, which is now in dispute, and we shall find no resemblance to balance between them. That of *Mant* departs almost every where from the Letter, and is rather an explanation or paraphrase, than a simple Version; whereas the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, on the contrary, follows the Letter throughout his whole Work, and adheres to the words of the Text, which renders it somewhat obscure, especially to those who are not well vers'd in the reading of the Sacred Books.

I should not disapprove the Remarks made by them in the same place, concerning certain words which they have inserted in their Translation in the *Italick* Character, if it were true, that they had added them only to express the Sense more clearly, or even to render their Version more conformable to the propriety of the *French* Tongue; nevertheless, without diminishing any thing of its exactness, and without departing from the Letter. But if we only cast an Eye on this Translation, we shall soon observe a great number of these Additions in the *Italick* Letter, that are not applied to their proper use, and which even sometimes alter or weaken the sense of the Original. What necessity was there, for example, to translate in the beginning of the Gospel according to St. *Matthew*, Chap. 1. ver. 6. *David qui fut Roy*, *David who was King*, making *qui fut, who was*, in *Italick*, as being added? It were more expedient, in my opinion, simply to interpret *le Roy David*, *David the King*, which perfectly expressed the *Greek* and *Latin*, and we thereby at the same time render the Article *Tu*, which is also included in the Original.

Moreover, they have translated, in ver. 20. of the same Chapter, *ceste forme du St. Esprit*, *was formed of the Holy Ghost*; the word *formé* is Printed in *Italick*, as an Addition, and it is intimated at the bottom of the Page, that we read according to the Letter, *est du St. Esprit*, *is of the Holy Ghost*. I am apt to believe, That it is much more convenient to place that in the Text of the Version, which is found in the bottom of the Page, and to transfer that to the Note which is express'd in the Translation. In Chap. 1. of St. *Matthew*, ver. 16. we read in this Version, *ayant envoyé des gens armés*, *he sent, having sent Soldiers*, *he sent to be Slaves*; and these words, *des gens armés*, *Soldiers*, are added in the *Italick* Character, as being an Addition. It might, it seems, be read more simply, *envoya guer*, *he sent to Slaves*, as Father *Amalric* has done.

These things, indeed, are but of very little moment, and they are p^{ro} pounded.

pounded only to represent the *Idea* of an accurate Version of the Bible, and to shew at the same time that the Translators of *Mons* are not altogether exact. In the sequel of this Discourse we shall produce other more important examples, whereby it will appear that these Gentlemen under colour of causing the Evangelists and Apostles to speak more clearly, by adding to their Text certain words in the *Italick* Letter, have introduc'd them, uttering such things as they never so much as imagin'd.

We may perceive in this Version, another defect not very remote from the former, which they have endeavour'd to justify in their Preface: Instead of simply Translating the words of the Text, they explain them in the body of their Version, as if the Notes were not appropriated to this sort of explication. As for instance, we read in the Vulgar conformably to the Greek Original, in chap. i. of *Luke*, ver. 5. *fait sacerdos quidam nomine Zacharias de vice Abia*, which words are thus Translated in the Version of *Mons*, *Il y avoit un Prêtre nommé Zacharie de la famille d'Abia, l'une des familles Sacerdotales qui servoient dans le Temple chacune en leur rang: There was a Priest named Zachary of the family of Abia, one of the Sacerdotal, that serv'd in the Temple every one in their order.*

This is plainly to insert the Commentary in the Translation, for we find only in the Text, *There was a Priest named Zacharias, of the rank or course of Abia*; neither is there any thing therein, that is *indeterminate and uncertain*. It is sufficient in a Translation clearly to express the Grammatical or Literal sense, there being no necessity to intermix with this Version all the illustrations that may be annexed to it in certain particular remarks, or in a Commentary. If it were requisite to explain what is meant by *this rank of Abia*, who was a Priest, this might be conveniently done in a separated Note.

But there is in this place (say they) in the *Latin*, as also in the *Greek*, a peculiar word containing certain *Ideas* that cannot be express'd in *French*, but by divers words, I answer, that these *French* words *du rang d'Abia, of the rank of Abia*, are extremely conformable to the *Latin de vice Abia*. That which has mislead the Translators of *Mons*, is, that they have imagin'd, that certain illustrations ought to be inserted in a Version in those passages wherein there is any obscurity: But in case they intended to observe this method, they ought not to attribute to their Work the simple name of a *Version*; but that of an *explain'd or paraphrastical Version*, as Mr. Godeau has call'd his Translation of the New Testament. We scarcely see any Books in which there are not contain'd certain terms, either of Art, or relating to peculiar Customs, or Manners, that are not generally known throughout the whole World: It is not expedient on this account, when we Translate them to explain these terms in the Text of our Version, to facilitate the understanding of them; much less ought this to be done with respect to the sacred Books, because there are some places in which this sort of Explication would be dangerous, especially when the Translators are not judicious, or maintain peculiar opinions.

Their

Their defect may well be imputed to *Luther*, for having assumed too much liberty in his Translation of the Bible, and it is very difficult not to attribute the same Errors to the Translators of *Port-Royal*, after the perusal of their Version of the New Testament.

Another defect in this Version, is, the inserting of certain expressions in the Text, which are not Literal, and the transferring at the same time those that are Literal to the Margent; to the end (say they) that we may not be depriv'd of the simple Interpretation of the Letter, and that we may judge (according to St. *Augustin's* phrase) of the liberty that has been taken in not exactly following it. But if we reflect a little on a considerable part of that which the Translators of *Mons* have plac'd in the Margent with the Letter (*l*) as being the mark of the Literal Sense, we shall be convinc'd that this ought to be in the Text, and that on the contrary, that which is found in the Text ought to be in the Margent. I do not apprehend how this method can be call'd an exactness, which seem'd to be necessary for the testifying of that respect which is due unto the Letter. If this happen'd only in those passages where the Letter includes harsh and barbarous Phrases, or certain *Hebraisms* too remote from our manner of speaking, I should have nothing to object against it; but the present debate is concerning literal and clear expressions, that are refer'd to the Margent, for the admission of others into the Text, that rather partake of the nature of an Explication, than of that of a Version.

Neither do I conceive to what purpose the testimony of St. *Augustin* is here alledg'd, since this Father (as hath been already observ'd) prefer'd the *Italic*, which very much adher'd to the Letter, before all other Versions. Can his Commendation of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter in these words: *Maluit pius interpret minus, Latine aliquid dicere quam minus* Ang. in Psal. 50. be applied to the Translators of *Port Royal*? These Gentlemen are accusom'd to cite St. *Augustin*, that they introduce him into all their discourses without much consideration.

I shall leave it to the judgment of those who have perus'd the Translation of *Mons*, whether it be true with respect to the style, that they have taken care to retain (as much as is possible) the air and character of that of the Holy Scripture; and that in regard that the style of the Gospel is extremely simple, they have endeavour'd to represent this admirable simplicity, by avoiding those tropes and manners of speaking, that have any savour of human Eloquence. If this were their design in Translating the New Testament; why have they affected to substitute select Phrases, and abundance of insignificant words, in the room of simple and vulgar expressions that were us'd by the Evangelists and Apostles. To what purpose have they banish'd from this Version divers words which a continual use hath authorized, and that have been, as it were, Canoniz'd in the Western Churches?

The Word *Scribe*, for instance, which is often found in the New Testament, is always express'd in this Version by that of *Doctor of the Law*. The reason of this alteration alledg'd by these Gentlemen in their Preface,

is, *That the word Scribe in our Tongue is taken in a notion altogether different from that of Scriba in the Gospel, signifying only a Writer or Transcriber; as if the word γραμματεὺς in Greek, and that of Scriba in Latin, were not as much equivocal in these two Languages, as that of Scribe in French.* According to this way of arguing, we must also condemn the Evangelists for appropriating the γραμματεὺς to signify a Doctor of the Law, since they might have made use of other terms that were more clear.

But they were not altogether so nice as the Gentlemen of Port-Royal; they followed in this and many other places the ancient Greek Bible, wherein they read the word γραμματεὺς: And the Latin Interpreter of the New Testament adhering to the Letter of the Greek Original, hath Translated it by that of *Scriba*. This word is so well known in the French Tongue that there is none that does not understand the meaning thereof, when it is pronounc'd *Scribe* in our Churches, and that it is found in all the Versions in the Vulgar Languages; the *Italians* have render'd it by *Scribi*, and the *Spaniards* by *Escribas*. *Diodati* who has Translated in Chap. 2. of *St. Matth.* vers. 4. *gli Scribi del popolo, the Scribes of the people*, explains in a Note the word *Scribi* by these; *Letterati, Dottori & Maestri in Scrittura*, that is to say, *Learned Men, Doctors and Masters in Writings*. *Castalio* who affects their too great a niceness to change in his Version the most part of those words that are usually call'd Consecrated, has nevertheless retain'd this.

It is likewise an effect of the nicety of the Translators of *Mons*, that instead of the word *Gebenna*, they have inserted that of *Enfer, Hell*. *Gebenna* (say they) is translated *Enfer*, and not *Geenne* or *Gène*, because the word *Gène* signifies at present a different thing in our Language from that of *Gehenna* in the Gospel, which is certainly taken there for the place where the damn'd are tormented, call'd by us *enfer Hell*. But if there be a necessity of changing all the words that may be interpreted in a different sense in the New Testament, their would remain many more alterations to be made in the Version of *Mons*.

The Evangelists had the Greek word Ἅδης, which they frequently applied after the Septuagint, to signify Hell; but forasmuch as that of *Gebenna*, which is *Heker* or *Chaldaick*, was very much us'd in their time, although it were invented by the *Rabbins*, in the sense that is here ascrib'd to it, they chose rather to make use thereof, than of Ἅδης, which was Greek. The ancient Latin Interpreter hath carefully preferr'd it, *Erasmus*, *Beza*, and even *Castalio* here likewise retain'd it; Lastly it is inserted by *Diodati* in his Italian Version *Geenna*, together with this Note in the Margent: *questa parola s'usa per le pene dell' inferno; this word is taken to signify the torments of Hell*.

Could not the Gentlemen of Port-Royal take away by a like Note, the ambiguity which is (in their opinion) apparent in the French Tongue in the word *Gène*? They thought fit rather to place the word *Enfer* in that Text of their Translation, and that of *Gène* in their Note. The
Ministers

Ministers of *Geneva*, who were not ignorant that the Word *Gene* signified otherwise in *French* than *Gebenne* in the Gospel, forbore not to preserve it in their Version. *Calvin*, *Beza*, and many other Divines, who have often revis'd this Translation, and have principally applied themselves to the retrenching of those words, that seem'd not to them to be pure *French*, have not omitted this; they were content only to describe in the Margent, its Original and Signification.

Moreover, they have not written *Gesue*, as the Translators of *Mons*, but *Gebenne*, to intimate the derivation thereof, which is *Hebrew*. It is Printed after this manner in the *French* Bible of *Antwerp*, which preceded that of *Olivitan*. And indeed there will be no ambiguity in this word. If we write *Gebenne* or *Geenne*, as it is found in the *Greek* Text of the New Testament. We should likewise at the same time explain its meaning, as *Diodeti*, and the other Ministers of *Geneva* have done in their Versions.

I do not believe that any judicious person will approve another Remark which the same Translators add in their Preface, when they affirm that it is not to depart from the Letter, to make use of divers words to express a single one. I durst avouch on the contrary, that an Interpreter who designs to represent the Character of the Author, whose Works he Translates ought not to alter his Version by using synonymous words; for if he be desirous to explain some of them, by others that are more clear and more known, they must not be inserted in the Text of the Version, but in the Margent, as several Translators of these latter times have done.

By this means we return the simple style of the Evangelists and Apostles, and even their words, as much as is possible, without rendring our selves unintelligible; whereas the Translation of *Mons*, which is full of Synonymous words and Phrases, does not exhibit to us the genuine Style of the New Testament. *When it happens* (say these Gentlemen in their Preface) *That two words are precisely substituted instead of one, because one of the two does not sufficiently express it, we have joyn'd these two words together by an And, in Italick, or by a Not, when the phrase is Negative, to shew that there is but one word in the Original.* But besides that, they have surrogated two words in the room of one, in divers places, where there is no *And* in *Italick*; they sometimes limit or weaken the Sense of the Original, by this Second explicative word; and then it becomes no longer the Sacred Text, but a certain Interpretation thereof, concerning which, all Men are not agreed.

They produce as an example of these two words, inserted in the place of one, this passage, of *Chap. 5. of St. Mark, vers. 29. Si oculus tuus dexter scandalizat*; which they have Translated thus; *Si vone œil droit vous est vous est un sujet de scandele & de chute*: *If your right Eye be unto you an occasion of scandal, and of falling.* They affirm that the word *Scandal* alone, usually admits another *Idea*, and that it is taken for that which offends us, and not for that which causeth us to fall. But *St. Jerom*,
 N n whom

whom they pretend to imitate, was not so nice: He hath Translated in many places of his Version, of the Old Testament, the Hebrew word (שְׂדָד) which signifies *laqueus*, by that of *Scandalum*.

However, we do not take it ill, that they have explain'd the word *Scandal*, by that of *Falling*, but this explication ought to be plac'd in the Margent, rather than in the Text of the Version. Is it not more expedient for example, to render those words of our Vulgar, in Chap. 24. of *St. Matthew*, vers. 10. *Scandalizabuntur multi* thus: *Plusieurs seront scandalisez; many shall be scandaliz'd*, then according to the Version of *Mons*, *Plusieurs trouveront des occasions de scandale & de chute. Many shall take an occasion of scandal and of falling?* They have subjoyn'd the former Interpretation, which is simple and natural at the bottom of the page; intimating that this is the literal Sense: They likewise observe the same method in many other places, as if the word *Scandalizeth* to *Scandalize*, were not pure French, or that being equivocal, it was necessary to make use of a *Periphrasis* to express it.

But the word *Scandalizo* is no less offensive in *Latin*, than *Scandalizer* in *French*, and it is sufficient, that we have been for a long time accusom'd to it: therefore the Learned Dr. *John Boys* could not allow the practise of *Erasmus*, *Beza* and divers other Modern Translators, who have chang'd it, especially that of *Beza*, whom the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have imitated in this place, and in many others. This Minister, instead of those words of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, in chap. 5. of *St. Matth.* ver. 29. *quod si oculus tuus dexter scandalizat te*, which exactly answer to the Greek, has substituted these; *quod si oculus tuus dexter facit ut in offendas*, *Cassiodorus*, *Keyna*, and *Cyprian de Valera* have likewise Translated in *Spanish* in imitation of *Beza*, *fuere occasion de caer*, that is to say, as it is express'd in the Version of *Mons*, *is an occasion unto you of falling*. It is true indeed, that these Gentlemen annex the word *Scandal* to that of *Falling*, and that this last is the explication of the former.

The above-cited Canon of *Ely* hath judiciously observ'd in his Remark on this passage of *St. Matthew*, (a) that the Verb *Scandalizat*, which is written in the ancient *Latin* Edition, being very well known among Christians, ought not to be taken away to place another in its room, altho it may sound somewhat harsh in the Ears of some persons that are too nice. He adviseth only to transfer that to the Margent, which has been inserted by these Modern Interpreters in their Version. We might apply to the Translators of *Mons*, several apposite Rules of the Critical Art, that have been above exhibited; in which, this Learned Prote-

(a) Vetus scandalizet te, verbo hoc sensu notissimo Christianis. Idcirco loco suo moveri nolim, etsi minus fortasse satisfecerit auribus delicatioribus. Que hujus loco, ab aliis ponuntur interpretibus sedem sibi querant in margine. Joann. Boys, Collat. vet. Interp. cum rec. ad. c. 5. Matth. vers. 29,

stant condemns the *Translation of Beza*, as being too remote from the vulgar.

We shall here mention another defect of the Version of *Mons*, which is very considerable, under colour of leaving no Sense uncertain and indeterminate, by reason that the *French Tongue* does not admit any dubious Expressions, they have frequently departed from the intention of the Evangelists and Apostles. These Translators endeavour to excuse themselves in their Preface, by alledging the example of the ancient Versions, that have been approv'd throughout the Catholick Church. *It is apparent (say they) that the Sense of the Hebrew Original is often determin'd and retrench'd in the Greek and Latin Versions of the Old Testament, and that in the Latin Translation of the New Testament many other significations are omitted, whereof the Greek Original is capable.* However, it is not lawful for Modern Interpreters to take too much liberty in their Versions on this account; neither does it appear that the Gentlemen of *Port Royal* are endued with sufficient skill, every where to make choice of the best Sense.

It is not sufficient, that they tell us, *That it is without doubt much more advantageous to the ignorant People, for whose use these Versions are more especially design'd, to meet with such a Sense as they are capable of understanding, than only to find a sort of confused Expressions, whereof they can comprehend nothing at all.* For it is to be fear'd, lest under this pretence, they should exhibit to us a *New Testament*, different from that of the Apostles and Evangelists.

They had reason to endeavour to prevent this ill consequence, by adding in the margin, at least in the most important places, the other Significations that might be attributed to the words of the Text: But forasmuch as they have sometimes follow'd the explications of the Fathers and other Commentators, which are not always Literal, it cannot be affirm'd, That they have altogether avoided those inconveniencies that were foreseen by them; neither does it appear, that they have sufficiently consider'd the Text of the Sacred Books, since their Learning consists chiefly in the reading of Commentaries, of which also they have not made an exact choice. However, a judicious Translator ought to express in his Version, the very words of his Original, as much as is possible to be done, without rendring himself un-intelligible.

I am apt to believe, That in Translating the Writings of *St. Paul*, they have taken a great deal of care in consulting all that has been produc'd on this subject, by the Fathers who have explain'd them; as also the Works of the most excellent Interpreters among our Modern Authors: But as for the Fathers, it is well known, that they have preferr'd *St. Augustin* before all others; and that with respect to the latter Commentators, they have been retain'd on the side of *Estim*; nevertheless, all People do not agree with them, that *St. Augustin* is the most clear-sighted of all the Fathers, especially in the knowledge of the Holy Scrip-

tures. And altho' *Estius* be a very able Divine, and shews much profound Learning in his Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul, yet he is full of certain particular notions, which he frequently propounds to himself as a general Rule.

Lastly, The Translators of *Port-Royal* declare, that they found not a little difficulty in determining, whether they ought to follow the Vulgar Translation or the Greek Text. Not that they were ignorant (say they) of the authority which the Council of Trent hath ascrib'd to the Latin Version, by pronouncing it to be authentick, and that they did not apprehend, that in the most part of those places where it appears to be different from the ordinary Greek Text, it is confirm'd by very ancient Greek Manuscripts. But they knew likewise, that the Greek Text, such as it is now extant in the Vulgar Editions, is frequently authoriz'd in divers passages where it differs from the Latin Version, both by the consent of many of the Fathers, that have made use of them, and by a great number of Roman Catholicks who maintain (as is acknowledg'd, even by Cardinal *PALLAVICINO*) That the Council of Trent, in declaring the ancient Latin Version to be authentick, intended only to avouch, That it contain'd nothing contrary to the Faith; but that they in no wise undertook to oblige all People to prefer it before the Greek Text, or to hinder any one from having recourse to it on several occasions.

It is to be admir'd, That the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, who have Translated the New-Testament for the use of the Ignorant People, as they themselves affirm, should find any difficulty in determining whether they ought to adhere to the Vulgar or to the Greek Text. Doth not even common Sense require, that they should deliver into the hands of the People, a Version of the Holy Scriptures, as they are read in their Church; according to the practice of all the Churches in the World? When the *Syrians* and *Copties* Translated the Bible into *Arabick* for the Instruction of their People, they did not deliberate, whether they should compose their New Translations from the Originals, or from their ancient Versions. The *Syrians* render'd their *Syriack* Version into *Arabick*, and the *Copties* their *Coptick* Translations into the same Language.

The matter in debate is not to know whether the Greek Text ought to be esteem'd beyond the Vulgar, or on the contrary; for whatsoever Sentiments we may have thereupon, we ought to exhibit to the People the Bible, as it is us'd in their Church; and this hath been observ'd by the most learned and judicious Persons of the Roman Catholick Communion; we need only to inspect the *German, English, Polish, Italian, Spanish,* and *French* Versions, composed by the Catholicks: They have all follow'd the Vulgar, excepting the *Italian* of *Brucoli*, and the *French* of *Monsieur de Marolles*. *Brucoli* discourseth like a Protestant in the Prefaces to his Bible; and as for the Abbot *de Villeloin*, he is much Inferior to the *Louvain* Divines, who never deliberated which of these two Methods ought to be observed by them, when they published a *French* Version of the whole Bible.

And

And indeed, none but the *Protestants* ever undertook to translate the Holy Scriptures into the Vulgar Tongue, from the Originals; who, in regard that they separated themselves from the Church of *Rome*, in which they were Educated, have likewise determined, that they were obliged to depart from their ancient Version; but all those proceedings shew, that they used too much precipitation in this matter. Therefore, It is not the simple Authority of the Council of *Trent*, that causeth us to prefer the Vulgar before all other Versions, but an un-interrupted Custom received above a Thousand Years ago, in the Western Churches; and the Bishops of this Council chiefly relied on this continual custom in declaring the Vulgar to be Authentick.

It is yet more surprising, That the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* should acknowledge, that the Vulgar is authorized by several very ancient Manuscripts, in the greatest part of the passages where it appears to be different from the ordinary *Greek* Text; and that, notwithstanding this Remark, they should intimate in a great number of places of their Version, where this Translation is conformable to these ancient *Greek* Manuscripts, that it differs from the *Greek*; as if there never had been extant any other *Greek* Text than that which is found in the common Editions.

I confess, that having perceived so great a defect in the Translation of *Mons*, I was immediately induced to believe, that it was made by some Student of *Port-Royal*, who had perused no other Original than the *Geneva* Version, or that of *Beza*, or even some other taken from the *Greek*, and who had annexed to this certain Commentaries. Indeed we find in this Version the marks of so great weakness (as will afterwards be evident) that it is difficult for any one that has never so little a knowledge of this matter, to judge otherwise thereof. The Translators of *Mons* seem to have endeavoured in their Preface to prevent the Objection that I have even now made, but they discover a notable inconvenience which it will be impossible to remove, but by casting their Work entirely into a new Model.

For, to what purpose do they affirm, That the *Greek* Text, such as it is now extant in the vulgar Editions is frequently authorized in divers passages, where it differs from the Latin Version, by the consent of many of the Fathers? Although this were true, does it follow from thence, that the name of *Greek* Text ought only to be attributed to that which is included in the ordinary Editions? Nevertheless, the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have done this in their Translation, as if the *Greek* Manuscript to which the Vulgar is conformable, were to be esteemed as nothing; doth it not appear on the contrary, that this old Edition, being set forth in the Primitive Ages of the Church, could not follow any Copies but such as were extremely ancient? I do not avouch, that these very ancient MSS. ought always to be preferred before the others; for the contrary has been prov'd in the first part of this History: But I maintain, that the Translators of *Mons* have exhibited a very bad Idea of the Vulgar,

gar, in asserting in their Version, without any restriction, that it varied from the *Greek* in many places, when it exactly agreed with the *Greek* Text that was extant at the time when it was compos'd.

Moreover, I am willing to admit, with the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, that a considerable number of *Roman* Catholick Divines are of Opinion, that the Council of *Trent*, in pronouncing the *Vulgar* to be Authentick, did not undertake to oblige all People to prefer it before the *Greek* Text, or to hinder any one from having recourse to it on several occasions. Doth this prove, that we ought to abandon this ancient Edition, to adhere unto the *Greek* Text, whensoever we design to deliver a Version of the Holy Scriptures into the heads of the People? These People do not stand in need of knowing the various readings in the Originals of the Bible; it is sufficient, that they understand that which is in use in their Church. The *Syrians* and the *Coptier* were not ignorant, that their Versions of the New-Testament were taken from the *Greek*; and that this *Greek*, as being the Original, is more exact in some places, and consequently that recourse may lawfully be had unto it; nevertheless, they forbore not to compose their *Arabick* Translations from their ancient Versions. If we are desirous to consult the *Greek* Text, it ought to be done in the Notes, that serve as an Illustration, according to the practice of the most able Commentators. We should have nothing to object against the Version of *Mons*, on this account, if this Method had been observ'd, which is consonant to the Sentiments of the Catholick Divines, who are cited by the Gentlemen of *Port Royal*, as favourable to their undertaking.

However, they believe, that they have devis'd an expedient, which may in some sort unite the *Vulgar* Translation, and the *Greek* Text, and that may cause both to be found in this Version. But whatsoever expedient they may imagine, it will never be approv'd by any Judicious Persons: For there are but two Methods to be chosen, either to Translate entirely from the *Greek*, as *Erasmus*, *Pagninus*, and many others have done in their *Latin* Versions, and as it is likewise practis'd by the *Protestants* in their Translations in the Mother-Tongue, or to Translate altogether from the *Vulgar* Edition, according to the manner of the *Roman* Catholick Interpreters.

Let us, nevertheless, take a view of their method; According to this design (say they) we have render'd the *Vulgar* Translation in the Text, because it is more in use in the Church (they ought rather to say, because it is alone in use in the Church of *Rome*, which is the matter in debate) If it happen to contain any thing that is not express'd in the *Greek*, we include it between two Crochets, with the Letter [V] which signifies, that these words are found only in the *Vulgar*: on the contrary, if there be any thing in the *Greek*, which is not likewise compris'd in the *Vulgar* Translation, we add it in the Text, together with this mark [G], whereby it is intimated, That the words included between these two Crochets are not read in the *Greek*. And in those places where the *Greek* Text is different from the *Vulgar*, we insert the Interpretation

of the *Greek* in the *Margent*, and that of the *Vulgar* in the *Text*, excepting only in some very few places, where it is acknowledg'd by the Learned, That the *Greek* is to be preferr'd before the *Latin*; and then we place the Translation of the *Greek* in the *Text*, and that of the *Vulgar* in the *Margent*.

This pretended expedient is a manifest proof, That the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* had not a true *Idea* of the measures that are requisite to be taken in Translating the Sacred Books: For first, since their design was to deliver to the People the *Vulgar* Translation, as they have declar'd in the Title of their Work, they ought always to represent it in the *Text* of their Version. The present affair is not to enquire, whether the *Vulgar* be always exact or not, but simply to Translate it: and forasmuch as they propos'd to exhibit it as the *Text*, it was not necessary to include any passages thereof between two Crochets, with the Letter [V].

Moreover, It is an evident untruth to affirm, That the words which are comprehended within these two Crochets, are only found in the *Vulgar*; it being certain, that the greatest part of them are likewise extant in the *Greek*; since they were written in the *Greek* Text, that was us'd by the ancient *Latin* Interpreter. The same thing may be averr'd, concerning the words contain'd within two Crochets, with the Letter [G], which are said to be read only in the *Greek*; for they oftentimes happen only to be express'd in some *Greek* Copies, and not in all, since they are not found in the ancient *Greek* MSS. from which the *Latin* Version was compos'd.

Again, It is not true to avouch, That they have annexed the Translation of the *Greek* in the *Margent*, in the places where the *Greek* Text differs from the *Vulgar*; for there is no difference in a great part of those places, between the *Vulgar* Translation and the *Greek* from which it was taken. As for the passages where they have plac'd the Interpretation of the *Greek* in the *Text*, and that of the *Vulgar* in the *Margent*, many more objections might be made against it. Altho' we should even grant, That it is confess'd by some Learned Men, That the *Greek* might well be esteem'd beyond the *Latin* in those places; nevertheless, it ought not, for that reason, to be Inserted in the *Text* of the Version; the natural place thereof being among the separated Annotations, where we may take liberty freely to declare our judgment concerning the variations of the *Greek* from the *Latin*. It were requisite to illustrate all these Observations by some Examples.

C H A P. XXXVI.

A particular Examination of the Version of Mons ; and first, of the differences that are therein describ'd between the Greek Text and the Vulgar, and of the Greek that is Inserted in the Text of this Version.

THE Gentlemen of Port-Royal promise in the Title of their Work, to Translate the New-Testament, according to the Vulgar Edition, together with the Variations of the Greek Text ; nevertheless, when we come to examine their Version, we find that they have omitted a great number of these differences of the Greek, nay, even the most important. My design is not here to produce all the places where the Greek Copies vary from the Latin : Forasmuch as the most part of these various Readings are Printed in the VI. Some of the Polyglot Bible of England, every one may consult them, and judge at the same time, that it is a great piece of negligence in the Translators of Mons not to have had recourse to them.

They would have done much better in leaving out all, than in representing only a part of them ; moreover, they sometimes insist on *punctilio's*, and mark a difference between the Greek Text and the Vulgar Translation, where there is not really any : On the contrary, they make no mention of many considerable Variations, which deserved to be carefully observ'd, at least with respect to the design that they had propos'd to themselves. I know not to what this capricious Humor may be attributed. To avoid tediousness, I shall only examine some Chapters of St. Matthew, from whence we may easily judge of the rest.

In the 1st Chapter of this Gospel, vers. 11. they take no notice of some Greek Copies, wherein we read a certain Genealogy which is not contain'd in the Vulgar ; nevertheless, this diversity is very well worth our observation, since this Genealogy is found not only in some MSS. but likewise in divers Greek Editions of the New-Testament, and among others in those of Simon de Colines and Flacius Illyricus, as also in some of those publish'd by Beza, besides that, it has been remark'd by many Commentators. This may be seen in the first part of this Critical History, where I have treated thereof.

Chap. 32.

These Gentlemen, on the contrary, in Chap. 2. of the same Gospel, v. 6. mark a difference between the Greek and the Vulgar, where there is none. We read in that place in the Vulgar, *qui regat populum meum*; and in their Version, *qui conduira mon peuple, who shall conduct my People?*

They

They have added in the Margent, That it is express'd in the *Greek*, *Qui sera le Pasteur de mon peuple ? Who shall be the Pastor of my People ?* There is none that would not conclude, in reading this Remark, That the ancient *Latin* Interpreter had not exactly render'd the *Greek*. However, the *Greek* Verb, *ποιμαίνει*, in this place, signifies literally, *Regat. Arias Montanus*, whose Version is generally too Literal, has not Translated it otherwise. We also find *Reget* in *Castalio's* Translation: *Erasmus* hath Interpreted it according to the same sense, *Gubernaturus est*. And the Author of the *Spanish* Version, Printed at *Venice*, in the Year 1556. which was compos'd from the *Greek* hath likewise us'd the word *Governara*.

The Translators of *Mons* seem not to have had any other Rule whereby to judge of that which was contain'd in the *Greek*, in this and several other places, than the example of some modern Translators. Indeed *Beza* hath render'd it *Pascet, Diodati, pascera*, and the Ministers of *Geneva, paisira*. It is true, that this last Interpretation expresses the Etymology or propriety of the *Greek* Verb *ποιμαίνειν*; but the other is no less Literal, as may be prov'd not only by divers places of Scripture, where this Verb is found, but likewise by profane Authors. That which hath often misled *Beza* and the other Translators of *Geneva*, is, that they determin'd, That they should Interpret the *Greek* words more Literally, by endeavouring to render them even in their very Etymologies; whereas they have not consider'd, that Scholars only are capable of Translating after this manner.

The Translators of *Port-Royal* have not observ'd in Chap. 3. of *St. Matth.* vers. 11. any difference between the *Greek* and the *Vulgar*: Nevertheless, there are many *Greek* Copies in which it is not written, *ἐν πυρὶ* and in *Fire*. The Criticks are divided thereupon; for some of them are of Opinion, that this word belongs to the Text, and others maintain that it was added afterwards. This variation may very well be observ'd, especially by those Persons that have taken notice of others, which are of less moment.

In Chap. 5. vers. 4. of the same Gospel, they have made this Remark on the fourth Beatitude, *In the Greek the second Beatitude is of those that Mourn, and the third of those that are Meek*. It is true, That the common *Greek* does not agree with the *Vulgar* in the order of these Beatitudes; but the ancient *Latin* Interpreter has follow'd that which was observ'd in the *Greek* Copies of his time: Therefore the Manuscript of *Cambridge* is conformable in this particular, to our *Latin* Edition, inasmuch that it cannot be affirm'd, that the latter is not consonant to the *Greek*, since it faithfully represents the ancient *Greek* Copies from which it was taken.

They make a further discovery of their negligence, in vers. 22. of this same Chapter, where they have added between two Crochets, the words, *Sans sujet, without a cause*, with the Letter [G], as if there were

a difference between the *Greek* and the *Vulgar*: However, if it be not Inserted in our *Latin* Edition, it is because St. *Jerom* thought fit to re-trench it, as not having found *ἐκ* in the most authentick *Greek* Copies of his time, as he himself declares in his Commentary on this place, in which he hath been follow'd by St. *Augustin*, *Cassian*, and *Cassiodorus*. It is true indeed, that we find at present this *Greek* word in the most part of our Copies; and that it was included in the ancient *Latin* Edition, before the Correction of St. *Jerom*. But if this Father determin'd that those *Greek* Copies were not exact; can they only be Cited at this day, as if there never had been any others? At least it ought to be remark'd that this word was not heretofore contain'd in some *Greek* Manuscripts, which this Father has preferr'd before all the others.

Vindication
of the N.T. of
Mons. against
F. Maim-
bourg.

The Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* are not to be discommended for observing this difference, since, as they themselves declare, it would be a sort of Unfaithfulness in the Translators of Mons, who were oblig'd to mark the variations of the *Greek*, not to take notice of this. But we may justly blame them for marking it in general without any restriction; For to affirm that Father *Amelote* hath cited but one *Greek* Manuscript, wherein the word *ἐκ* was not express'd, and that it is found in all the others, can be no plea on their behalf; since besides that there remain in our possession but very few of these ancient Manuscripts that are like to that of the *Vatican*, and which agree in this particular passage with the *Vulgar*, it is sufficient that it was not read by St. *Jerom* in his best *Greek* Copies, to infer from thence, that the *Vulgar* hath not departed from the *Greek* in that place.

To discover the little Uniformity that appears in the whole Work of these Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, we need only to read their remark on Chapter 6. of St. *Matth.* vers. 13. where they have judiciously observ'd, that these Words which are extant in the vulgar *Greek*, *for thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever*, are not found in some *Greek* Manuscripts. It is certain there are very few Manuscripts in which they are omitted. The ancient Fathers, who in like manner have not read them, followed the *Latin* Edition which was in use before the time of St. *Jerom*, wherein they were not actually included, no more than in the *Greek* Manuscript of *Cambridge*.

I would now demand of these Translators, why they have not made the same reflection in most part of the other places where they cite the *Greek*, as they have done here? What reason had they in these other passages to mark the *Greek* Text absolutely and without any limitation, as if there were no diversity among the *Greek* Copies? I cannot apprehend to what purpose they have made mention of these ancient Manuscripts in some places, where there are very few that differ from the ordinary-Editions of the *Greek* Text. As for instance, in Chap. 19. of St. *Matthew*, vers. 17. they have preferr'd the common *Greek* before the *Vulgar* Translation, by inserting the former in the Text of their Version,
and

and the later in the Margent with this Note, that *it is conformable to some ancient Greek Copies*, nevertheless there are very few of this nature. If they were exact they would observe the very same method in all the places of their Version where this happens.

In Chapter 6. of the same Gospel, vers. 1. where we find in the Vulgar *justitiam vestram* they have Translated *vos bonnes œuvres*, *Your good Works*, intimating at the same time in the Margent, that it is literally *Your Justice*, and in the Greek *Alms* or *Justice*. This observation appears not to be accurate, no more than the Translation, for the Greek Text and the Vulgar agree together. We read in the ordinary Greek *ἐλεημοσύνη* *Alms*, and in some Copies *δικαιοσύνη*, *Justice*. But the word *Justice* is the same thing in this place (according to the style of these times, which is confirmed by the *Rabbins*) as that of *Alms*; and therefore *Gabriel Sionita* has Translated the Syriack word *ܐܠܡܝܢܐ*, which signifies as to the Grammatical sense *your Justice*, by *eleemosyna vestra*, *your Alms*.

In the fourth Verse of the same Chapter, they have comprehended within two Crochets with the Letter G. these words, *devant tout le monde*, *before the whole World*; as if the Vulgar were not conformable in this place to the Greek, in which they are contain'd. It is certain nevertheless that the *Latin* Interpreter hath not express'd them in his Version, because they were not extant in his Greek Copy, as indeed they are not in the ancient Manuscript of *Cambridge*, nor in that of the *Vatican*. St. *Augustin* declares likewise that he found them not in the Greek Text of his time, altho' they were included in some *Latin* Copies. Moreover, I have elsewhere observ'd, that I have not read them in two Manuscripts of Monsieur *Colbert's* Library.

There are certain passages in the Version of *Mons* which are render'd after a very particular manner; as not being express'd according to the Greek, nor conformably to the Vulgar. Thus in Chapter 8. of St. *Matth.* vers. 30. where it is read in the Greek Text, *there was a good way off from them*, and in the Vulgar *there was not far from them*, they have Translated, to reconcile these two expressions, which seem to be contrary one to another *Il y avoit au dela d'eux un peu plus loin*, *there was on the other side of them a little farther*. Mr. *Arnaud* produceth this example as a certain Rule that ought to be followed, whensoever there appears any contrariety between the Greek Copy and the Vulgar *Longè & non longè* (says this Learned man) *may be affirm'd of that which is a little farther off*. It is to be fear'd lest some persons should object to the Translators of *Mons*, that they cause St. *Matthew* to speak after the manner of the Oracles, that were generally deliver'd in obscure and ambiguous terms, to which contrary significations might be attributed. But we must not thus Translate the Sacred Books, the words whereof admit only one Grammatical or Literal Sense.

Cr. Hist. of
the Text of
the N.T. ch.
32.

M. Arnaud's
New def. of
the Transla-
tors of the
N.T. Print-
ed at Mons.
Book I. Ch. I.

Bez. Annot.
on Math.
Ch. 8. v. 30.

If we design to Translate this passage from the *Greek*, it ought to be interpreted; *there was a good way off from them*; but if we follow the reading of the *Vulgar*, which I take to be the most genuin, it must be render'd *there was not far from them*. *Beza* who Translated from the *Greek*, *erat autem longe ab eis*, hath done so much justice to the *Latin* Interpreter, as to prefer his Version in this place before the *Greek* Copies, altho' it were not confirm'd by any Manuscript, *Vulgata*, (says he) non longè, *repugnante quidem fide omnium Græcorum exemplarium quæ nobis videre contigit, sed tamen rectius, ni fallor, quam absque negante particulâ*. And indeed, this third sense which is express'd in the Version of *Port-Royal*, being found neither in the *Greek*, nor in the *Latin*, can be grounded only on a mere ratiocination. This induceth me to believe that the Authors of this Translation have not a clear and distinct *Idea* of the method that ought to be observ'd in making an exact Version of the Holy Scriptures.

According to this Erroneous Notion they have render'd these words of Chap. 8. of St. *John's* Gospel, vers. 25. *principium qui & loquor vobis* after this manner. *Il suis dès la commencement, & c'est ce que je vous dis; I am from the beginning, and this is that which I say unto you*: For they express neither the *Greek* nor the *Latin*, altho' upon a more exact scrutiny, it will appear that there is no difference between them. But in regard that they have rather follow'd the Commentators as their Guide, than the Text of the New Testament, this obliges them sometimes to depart from the true sense thereof; the same thing hath likewise befall'n them in this place, where they endeavour to reconcile the *Grecian* and the *Latin* Fathers, who have explain'd it after different manners.

In Chap. 9. vers. 8. of St. *Matthew*, where they have Translated *fu- rent remplis de crainte* were fill'd with fear, as it is in the *Vulgar*; they observe in the Margent that instead of *fear* there is the word *admiration* in the *Greek* Text; which is true as to the present *Greek*, where we find *θαύμασον*, but not with respect to the *Greek* that was us'd by the ancient Interpreter who read *ἐφοβήθησαν*, as it is written in the Manuscript of *Cambridge*, and in some others: Moreover the *Syrian* Translator hath read no otherwise in the *Greek* Original.

The Translators of *Mons* discover another false *Idea* of our *Vulgar*, in vers. 13. of the same Chapter, where they have included between two Crochets with the Letter G. these words *a la penitence, to repentance*; as if the ancient Interpreter had abandoned the *Greek* Text, whereas he hath exactly follow'd the *Greek* Manuscripts of his time. Indeed we do not read in the Manuscript of *Cambridge* and in some others, *eis μετανοίας*; neither has the *Syriack* Interpreter express'd it, because it was not extant in his *Greek* Copy. Moreover their negligence is yet more evident in Chapter 10. vers. 12. where they comprehend within two Crochets with the Letter V. this expression, *en disant que la paix soit dans cette maison, in saying peace be unto this House*, as if it were only contain'd in the *Vulgar* Translation. It

It were needless to insist any longer on a defect that is so generally conspicuous throughout the whole Version of *Mons.* Those Translators have scarcely alledg'd any instance of the variations which they affirm to be between the *Greek* and the *Vulgar*, wherein they are not deceiv'd. They almost always pre-suppose, that there is no other *Greek* Text, but that which is found in the ordinary Editions, as if the ancient *Latin* Interpreter could consult any other *Greek* Copies than those that were extant in his time. It is on the account of their Antiquity that they are not to be found at present in so great numbers as the ordinary Copies. But it is sufficient that some of them, as yet, remain in our possession; whereby we may judge that our *Latin* Edition is conformable to the *Greek*, in most part of the places where the Translators of *Port-Royal* take notice of any difference between that and the *Greek* Text.

If they affirm that by the *Greek*, they understand nothing else but the *Greek* Text which is compris'd in the common Editions, I answer that they explain themselves very ill, and that their explication is not to be admitted, since the ancient *Greek* from which the *Vulgar* Translation was Compos'd, is no less the *Greek* Text of the New Testament than the ordinary *Greek*; besides that it oftentimes agrees with the ancient Versions that were taken from the *Greek*. It is to represent a very false *Idea* of the Translation of the Interpreter of the Church, to assert that it absolutely differs from the *Greek* in those passages, where it is not conformable to the *vulgar Greek*. These Gentlemen perhaps have not consider'd that in explaining their meaning after this manner, they maintain with all their might the modern Versions of the Protestants, who have only abandon'd our *Vulgar*, because they imagin'd that it varied too much from the *Greek* Original.

There is another considerable defect in the Version of *Mons*; they have sometimes inserted the *Greek* Text in the body of their Translation, altho' they promise in the Title of their New Testament to follow the *Vulgar*. To excuse this fault which is very obvious, they declare in their Preface, that this occasion happens but very rarely, and even in those places where it is acknowledg'd by all judicious persons that the *Greek* is to be preferr'd before the *Latin*.

But admit that it were true, that the *Greek* is to be preferr'd before the *Latin* in those places, ought they not always to call to mind that they Translated the *Latin*, and not the *Greek*? It were sufficient to describe in their Notes, the various readings of the *Greek*; Nay they might also freely profess that the *Greek* appear'd to them in these passages to be more Authentique than the *Latin*. This is the method that ought to be observ'd by an able Translator, to the end that he may retain an absolute Uniformity in his Work. *Erasmus*, who Translated the New Testament from the *Greek*, hath not adjoyn'd to the Text of his Version the readings of the *Vulgar* in those places where he believ'd it to be more exact than the *Greek*; he is content only to mark them in his Annotations, and to observe

observe at the same time, that he had reason to esteem the *Latin* of the *Vulgar* in these passages, even beyond his *Greek* Copies.

All judicious persons are so far from being favourable to the sentiments of these Gentlemen of *Port Royal* in all the places where they take the liberty to depart from the ancient *Latin* Edition, to adhere to the *Greek*, that I am apt to believe on the contrary, that they will be offended by reason that they have abandon'd it in Chap. 3. of *St. Mark*, vers. 16. to follow the Translation of *Beza* and other Ministers of *Geneva*. They have Translated with them in this passage *le premier fut Simon; the first was Simon*; nevertheless the word *first*. is not found neither in the *Latin* nor in any *Greek* Copy, at least of those that have been transmitted to us, altho' they are very many in number.

The Translators of *Mons* declare that they are beholden to *Beza* for this remark, they affirm in their Note, *that this is the most natural sense, and that which is contain'd in some Greek Copies that Beza has likewise follow'd.* Forasmuch as I do not here undertake to exercise the function of a decider of Controversies, I shall not go about to examine whether this *Calvinist* might have a design to render the Primacy of *St. Peter* dubious, by his Translation; it is sufficient that I prove that he was mistaken in not following in this place the *Greek* Text, after the same manner as it was extant in all his *Greek* Copies; and that the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* are more blame-worthy than he, since they Compos'd their Version from the *Latin*: I dare also peremptorily to avouch, that excepting the Doctors of *Geneva*, very few Learned men are of their Opinion.

Beza who had a great number of various readings taken from several *Greek* Copies, produces none to confirm this that is now in debate: He only cites *Erasmus*, who assures us, that he has read in some *æἰὲν*

Bez. Annot. in Ch. 3. v. 16. *Σίμωνα. Hæc versio (says this Minister) testatur Erasmus in nonnullis Græcis Codicibus non extare, & ex Matthæo desumpta arbitratur; Ego verò non dubito quin hæc sit germana lectio.* The Translators of *Mons* have likewise intimated after him in their Note, *that this is the natural sense*: But as I take it they ought much rather to follow *Erasmus*, who after having remark'd that he has read thus in some MSS. Copies, adds that this is not the genuin reading, as not being in the correct Copies, nor in the

Erasm. Not. in Ch. 3. Mark. Works of *Theophylact*, nor in the *Greek* Edition of *Aldus*. *Nonnulli (says he) Græci Codices habent æἰὲν Σίμωνα, sed in emendatis non legitur, & videtur ex Matthæo desumptum.*

Upon the whole matter, we may well give credit to the Testimony of *Erasmus*, for this reading is not found in any of the MSS. of *R. Stephen*, nor in the Collection which is Printed in the VI. Tome of the *Polyglott* Bible of *England*, nor in the New Testament of *Oxford* containing above an hundred MSS. nor even in any of the ancient Versions. I might add to all these many other *Greek* MSS. that I have perus'd, wherefore I would willingly demand of the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, whether the single Authority of *Beza* can be thought sufficient to counter-balance that of

of so great a number of *Greek* Copies both Manuscripts and Printed, to which the Translation of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter is conformable?

Dr. *John Boys* could not approve the rashness of this Divine of *Geneva*, who durst prefer certain MSS. cited by *Erasmus*, which he hath at the same time rejected as little exact to the best Copies that have been follow'd by our Interpreter: He adds that he himself has also consulted Jo. Boys many of them, and that he found in none *αἰὲν Σίμωνα*. *Simplicissimi* Collat. vet. *mum ergo* (says this Learned Protestant) *mibi videtur cum vetere Interprete* Int. cum rec. *optimorum exemplarium fidem sequi, & ni fallor memento majorum. Multa* ad c. 3. Mar. v. 16. *enim consului, necdum videre licuit ubi scriptum esset αἰὲν Σίμωνα*. Can the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* avouch after this, that they have only inserted the *Greek* in the Text of their Version, in these places where it is acknowledg'd by all judicious persons that the *Greek* ought to be preferr'd before the *Latin*? On this account, there are judicious persons no where but at *Geneva*.

I dare not propound to these Gentlemen Father *Coton* as a judicious person; however he has not forbore oppositely to observe, that it is a ridiculous attempt of *Beza* in endeavouring to persuade us to read *αἰὲν* first P. 1st. Gen. in *St. Mark's* Gospel, where 'tis not express'd; and that he doubts whether it ought to be read in that of *St. Matthew*, Chap 10. vers. 2. where it is found in all the Copies. *Cassiodorus*, *Reyna* & *Cyprian de Valera*, who frequently imitate the Doctors of *Geneva* in their *Spanish* Version, have Translated in this passage of *St. Mark*, a *Simon a qual puso por nombre Pedro*, to *Simon* or whom he impos'd the name *Peter*, without expressing the word *αἰὲν*; which they did not read in the *Greek*. We likewise find according to the same sense, in the other *Spanish* Version of the New Testament, Printed at *Venice* in the year 1556. y a *Simon puso por nombre Pedro*.

I cannot apprehend what reason the Translators of *Mons* had to insert in Chap. 19. of *St. Matthew*, vers. 17. the reading of the ordinary *Greek* in their Version, and that of the *Vulgar* in their Note, where they confess that the *Latin* Edition is conformable in that place to some *Greek* Copies. Indeed the ancient *Latin* Interpreter hath read in his *Greek* Copy, as it is at present in the *Vulgar*; which might be prov'd by the ancient MS. of the *Vatican*, and by that of *Cambridge*, whereto we may add two of the MSS. of *Robert Stephen*. *Grotius* who is one of the most learned and most judicious Commentators on the New Testament, even according to the Testimony of the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, hath preferr'd this ancient *Greek* reading before that which is extant in the ordinary Editions, *Cum & vetustiora & emendatiora exemplaria* (says this learned Critick) *hanc lectionem preferant, quam secutus est non vetus tantum, quo* Grot. V. no. *nunc utimur, Latinus Interpres, sed & illi Codices quibus usi sunt Augustinus,* ad c. 19. *Hieronimus atque alii, multo est credibilis lectionem alteram ex Marco & Luca huc traductam, quod saepe accidit, quam istam aliunde irrepsisse.* Mat. v. 17. There- fore it is not true, that these Gentlemen have inserted the *Vulgar Greek*

in the Text of their Version, only in those places where it is confess'd by all judicious persons, that it is to be preferr'd before the *Latin*.

What necessity was there of Translating in Chap. 6. of *St. Mark*, vers. 36. according to the ordinary Greek, *afin qu'ils s'en aillent acheter du pain dans les villages & les Bourgs d'icy autour parce qu'ils n'ont rien a manger ; That they may go and buy Bread in the Villages and Boroughs round about, because they have nothing to eat ?* We read in the Vulgar, according to F. Amelote's Translation ; *afin qu'ils aillent dans les villages & dans les Bourgs voisins acheter des vivres pour manger ; That they may go into the neighboring Villages and Boroughs to buy Victuals to eat.* The Greek Text, and the Vulgar Translation do not differ as to the Sense ; Moreover, the Ancient Interpreter hath rendred it according to the reading of his Greek Copy, which is also retain'd in the *Cambridge MS.* *St. Jerom* did not think fit to alter the ancient Vulgar in this place. The Translators of *Mons* would likewise have acted more prudently in preserving it in their Version : For if their method were observ'd, a good part of the *Latin* Edition must be reform'd from the Vulgar Greek, which would be a very great absurdity.

According to this method, they have Translated in Chap. 12. of *St. Mark*. Vers. 4. *Ils le chasserent apres luy avoit fait toute sorte d'outrage ; They drove him away, after having done to him all manner of injuries*, which answers to the Vulgar Greek Text, in which it is written *καὶ ἀπέσειλαν ἰπποκρίαν*. Whereas the ancient Interpreter, who read in his Greek Copy, *καὶ ἰπποκρίαν*, as it is in the MS. of *Cambridge*, hath simply render'd, *& contumeliis effecerunt ; And they treated him contumeliously.* I would willingly demand of the Translators of *Mons*, whether it were necessary in this place to prefer the present Greek before the old *Latin* Edition, which is conformable to the ancient Greek Copies.

It were in my Opinion more judicious to Translate in Chap. 1. of *St. Luke*, vers. 1. of things that have been accomplish'd among us, conformably to the Vulgar, wherein we read, *que in nobis completa sunt rerum*, than to render with the Version of *Mons*, *des choses dont la verité a esté connue parmy nous avec une entiere certitude ; of things the truth of which hath been known among us with an absolute certainty.* Indeed there is no diversity of Readings in this place in the Greek Copies : but since the Verb *πληροποιεῖν* which is express'd in the Greek, may be interpreted after the same manner as it is Translated in our Vulgar ; as the Jesuit *Meldones*, has prov'd by other examples ; A Translator that hath propos'd to himself to adhere to the Vulgar, ought to prefer this later Sense before the other, being content to take notice of the former in a particular Note. The Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have plainly done the contrary, for they have inserted the former in the Text of their Translation, and have observ'd in their Note, that *this Sense, as being according to the Greek, appear'd to be more natural.* As if the Interpreter of the Church had departed from the Greek Text. In this point they come near to the Opinion of *Beza*, who

who has accus'd this ancient Interpreter, of having ill Translated the Greek Verb *ἰδόντες*.

I shall not condemn the Translators of *Mons* for rendering in Vers 29. of the same Chapter of *St. Luke*, *alle l'ayant veu*, *the having seen him*; altho it were more expedient, according to their design, to Translate with the Vulgar, *the having heard him*, Mr. Arnaud had reason to affirm, that *Erasmus*, *Beza*, and the other Ministers of Geneva, who profess to Translate the Greek and not the Vulgar, ought to render *Vidisset* and not *audisset*, because the former word is express'd in the Greek Text. But as I take it, according to this same Argument the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* ought to render, *having heard*, since *audisset* is found in the Latin, which they Translated; and in regard that the Censors of *Rome* have retain'd this reading in our Vulgar, notwithstanding the diversity of the Latin Copies; besides that this Reading is confirm'd by some Greek MSS. There is no necessity of enquiring here, which of these two Readings is the most Genuine, since this Question may be discuss'd in a Note; if it shall be thought convenient, as *Beza* has done in this place.

M. Arnaud's
New Vind. of
the Transla-
tors of the
N.T. Print-
ed at Mons.
Book 5. Ch. 2.

It were likewise more expedient, according to this Principle, to Translate in Chap. 3. of *St. Luke*, Vers. 15. *le peuple s'imaginant*; *the people imagining*, because it is read in the Vulgar *existimante populo*, than to render these words thus; *le peuple estant dans un grande attente*; *The people being in great expectation*. Forasmuch as the Greek word is capable of being explain'd after these two manners. *Beza* might well make choice of this last Interpretation, in regard that he undertook to Translate the Greek Text; but the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, ought not to agree in their Version with this Minister, who condemns the Vulgar in this place. They are content only to intimate in their Note, That it is literally *pensant, thinking*; which must be understood as the meaning of the vulgar Translation.

What reason had the Translators of *Mons* to render with the Doctors of Geneva, *une poule a hen* in Chap. 13. of *St. Luke*, Vers 34. and to observe in their Note that is read in the Vulgar, *Viseau, a Bird*, as if it did not express in that place, the Greek word *ὄρνις*, which nevertheless signifies a Bird, in general, as well as a Hen in particular: Therefore *Erasmus* thought fit to retain in his Version the Latin word *Avis*, which is in the Vulgar. I know not whether it be accidentally or through affectation, that these Gentlemen agree in many places with *Beza*, in departing from the Vulgar. This Minister could not allow that the Latin Interpreter should Translate *Avis* in this passage, and *Gallina* in that of *St. Matthew*, *Vulgata* (says he) *avis, quasi ignorârit hac voce peculiariter quoque gallinam significare, cum tamen gallinam verberit Matth. 23. 37.* This proves on the contrary, that he understood the two significations of this Greek word, since he made use of both in his Version.

They have likewise Translated with *Beza* in Chap. 15. of *St. Luke*, Ver. 30. conformably to the ordinary Greek *Voire bien, your substance.* Decla-

ring in the Margent, that we find in the Vulgar his substance. This Divine hath observ'd in his Note, that the reading of the *Greek*, is more emphatical than that which is contain'd in the Vulgar. It was requisite that the Translators of *Port-Royal* should bear a greater respect to his Authority, than to that of the Ancient Interpreter; nevertheless he is mistaken when he adds, that we read in all the *Greek* Copies $\sigma\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \beta\iota\omicron\nu$, for it is written in the ancient MS. of *Cambridge*, which he then had in his possession, $\pi\omicron\ \delta\epsilon\ \iota\tilde{\omega}\ \sigma\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\alpha\rho\omicron\nu\eta\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$.

In Chap. 5. of *St. John's* Gospel, Ver. 2. they would have done better in Translating *une piscine a brebis*, a *Sheep-pond*, conformably to the Vulgar, and they might subjoyn this remark in their Note, that the Reading which is extant in the present *Greek* seem'd to them to be the most; nevertheless, according to this reading the *Greek* word $\pi\lambda\eta$ must be either supplied or understood, and consequently they ought to mark that of *Porte-gate* in the *Italick* Character, But is possible, that the *Latin* Interpreter read in his *Greek* Copy $\omega\epsilon\lambda\alpha\pi\lambda\eta\ \kappa\omicron\lambda\upsilon\mu\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\eta\varsigma$, a *Sheep-Pond*, as some of the Fathers have done, and this Reading is confirm'd by the Oriental Versions, Wherefore the Translators of *Mons* had no reason to declare in their Note, that they have adher'd to the *Greek* in this place, as if there had never been extant any other *Greek* Text, than that which is compriz'd in the ordinary Edition.

I am apt to believe with the Gentlemen of *Port-royal*, that the Sense which is exhibited in the *Greek*, in Chap. 10. of *St. John*, Vers. 29. is more proper than that of the *Latin*, where we read, *Pater meus quod dedit mihi majus omnibus est*: But since they undertook to Translate the Vulgar and not the *Greek* Text, it was requisite to insert in their Version, *that which my Father hath given me is greater than all things*, and they might observe at the same time in their Note, that this Exposition ought rather to be render'd according to the *Greek*, which appears in this place to be more natural: *My Father who gave them to me is greater than all*. The reading of the Vulgar is establish'd in the Works of the *Latin* Fathers, even of the most Ancient, which ought to serve us as a Rule, especially in a Translation that is to be deliver'd into the hands of the People, which should agree with the Scriptures that are publickly read in the Churches.

In Chap. 16. of *St. John*, Vers. 13. They have follow'd the Grammatical Sense of the *Greek* Text, by Translating, *Il vous fera entrer dans toutes les veritez*; *He will cause you to enter into all Truth*. As if this other Sense that is comprehended in the Vulgar, and which they have transferr'd to their Note, *He will teach you all truth*; were not exactly conformable to the *Greek*. But Dr. *John Boys* could not allow this practice of the Modern Translators, who have chang'd *Docebit*, which is included in our *Latin* Edition, into another word. *Vetus* (says this Learned Protestant) *non malè; nam & ὁ διδάσκων suo modo ὁδηγεῖ, & ὁ ὁδηγῶν suo modo διδάσκει*. He produceth as a proof, a passage in Chap. 8. of the *Acts*, Vers. 31. where we read in the *Greek*, according to this same sense, $\delta\omicron\delta\eta\gamma\omicron\sigma\alpha\iota\ \mu\epsilon$. What

Jo. Boys
Collat. vet.
Int. cum rec.
ad c. 16.
Joann. v. 13.

What necessity was there to change in Chap. 10. of the *Acts of the Apostles*, Vers. 15. the word *Brethren* which is express'd in the Vulgar, conformably to the most ancient *Greek* Copies, wherein we find ἀδελφῶν, into that of *Disciples*, which is read in the ordinary *Greek* Editions? Moreover, Why have they not follow'd the same Vulgar, in Chap. 2. of the *Acts*, Vers. 31. where we read, *Neque derelictus est in inferno; He was not left in Hell*, as it is in the most ancient *Greek* Copies? They chose rather to Translate, *His Soul was not left in Hell*, because they found the word ψυχή, Soul in the present *Greek* Text.

Thus, in adhering to this ordinary *Greek*, they have render'd in Verse 42. of the same Chapter, *Recurrent de bon cœur; Received gladly*, whereas we read only *Receperunt Received*, in the Vulgar, conformably to the most ancient *Greek* Copies, in which the word ἀσμένως is not found; neither ought it to be express'd by the Translators of *Mons* in their Version, In Vers. 43. of the same Chapter, they have not render'd these words which are contain'd in the Vulgar, *In Jerusalem & metus erat magnus in universis*. The reason alledg'd by them in their Note is; That that which abounds in the Vulgar more than in the *Greek*; appears to be taken from two different Translations of the beginning of this Verse. But they have not consider'd that we find in the ancient Copy of *Alexandria*, and in some other *Greek* MS. ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ φόβος τε καὶ μέγας ὅτι πάντας. And therefore that which is included in the Vulgar does not proceed from different Translations, but from the *Greek* Original.

It ought likewise to be Translated in Chap. 3. of the *Acts of the Apostles*, Vers. 1. *Par notre Autorité, By our authority*, and not *Par notre Sainteté, By our Holiness*. Indeed this last Interpretation is Consonant to the ordinary *Greek* Text, in which there is the word ἐκτελέσια: But we find *potestate* in the Vulgar, and in the *Syriack* Version, which was as compos'd from the *Greek* ἐκτελέσια according to the same Sense. The *Marquess de Vellez* has likewise read in one of his MS. of *Spain* ἐξουσία.

In the 20. Chap. of the *Acts*, vers. 7. where it is Printed in the Version of *Mons* according to the present *Greek* Text, *les disciples estant assembles, the Disciples being assembled*, it were more expedient to Translate, *comme nous estions assemblez, as we were assembled*, because it is express'd in the Vulgar, *cum convenissemus*, conformably to the most ancient *Greek* Copies, in which we read συνηγμένων ἡμῶν; besides that this reading is confirm'd by the *Syriack* Interpreter. Moreover, having once follow'd the Vulgar *Greek*, to retain a constant Uniformity in their Translation, they ought likewise to adhere to it in the following Verse, and to render, *where they were assembled, and not where we were assembled*; for we find in the common Editions of the *Greek* ὅπου ἦσαν συνηγμένοι, *Beza*, who has Translated according to the present *Greek* *ubi erant congregati*; nevertheless in his Note, authorizeth the other reading, which is contain'd in the *Syriack*, and in the ancient *Greek* Copies that were us'd by the *Latin* Interpreter.

In Chapter 24. of the *Acts*, vers. 22. where we read in the Greek ἀνεκβύλεον εἰδὼς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁδοῦ, they have inserted in their Version, *lors que je me feray plus exactement informé de cette Secte*, when I shall be more exactly inform'd concerning this Sect, which answers to these words of Beza's Translation, *postquam exquisitius pernovero quæ ad viam istam pertinent*. And that it might not be imagin'd that they had no reason to depart in this place from the ancient *Latin* Version, they have declar'd in their Note; that according to the *Vulgar*, it should be render'd *scabant très-bien ce que c'estoit que cette voye, ou Secte*, having a perfect knowledge of this way, or Sect. They add at the same time, that they have adher'd to the *Greek* Text, as containing a more clear and more probable sense; as if the *Greek* were not well express'd in the *Vulgar*, wherein nevertheless, it is exactly Translated word for word: Moreover *Erasmus* and *Castalio*, who were very well vers'd in the *Greek*, have likewise made choice of this Interpretation. The Learned Dr. *John Boys* observes also, that (a) *Beza*, whom the Translators of *Mons* have imitated, hath abandon'd the other Interpreters, having stated the case otherwise than they; He opposeth to them all the ancient *Greek* Interpreters, and produceth in particular the express words of *St. Chrysostom*, whom the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* cannot accuse as not having understood the *Greek* Tongue. That which hath misled them, is, that they have only consulted the *Greek* in the Versions of the Doctors of *Geneva*, or in the Annotations of some Commentator who has follow'd them, not considering that these different Interpretations proceeded from the Translators, and in no wise from any difference between the *Greek* and the *Vulgar*; therefore the *Syriack* Version is altogether conformable in this place to our *Latin* Edition.

Furthermore, they have Translated with *Beza*, and the other Ministers of *Geneva* in Chap. 26. of the *Acts*, vers. 5. *suivant l'exemple de mes ancestres*, following the example of my Ancestors; and they have plac'd in the Margent the other Interpretation that is consonant to the *Vulgar*, and which was retain'd by *Erasmus* in this place, as very well expressing the sense of the *Greek* Text. Therefore Dr. *John Boys*, after his usual manner, judiciously Vindicates the ancient Interpreter against *Beza*; he affirms

(a) *Beza* suam quamdam hic rationem secutus est, ab omnibus aliis credo dissentiens. Τελειὰν enim στυλὸν ponit post ἀνεκβύλετο αὐτὰς, & verba quæ sequuntur Felicis esse vult sic propemodum dicentis, Nondum satis compertum habeo qualis sit via sive secta ista: dabo operam ut melius mihi nota sit. Ubi vero plus mihi notitiæ de hac re comparavero, & *Lyfias* huc descenderit, tum demum quæ sit mea de negotio vestro sententia audietis. At *Græci* Interpretes uno ore affirmant Felicem ideo distulisse causâ istius cognitionem, non quod sectæ ignarus esset, aut pleniorē sibi noticiam ejus comparare cuperet, sed quia cum satis illam cognitā jam haberet, *Judeos* amplius sibi molestos esse nolebat. Quid clarius esse potest his verbis *Chrysostomi* &c. *Joann. Boys*, Collat. vet. Interp. cum rec. ad c. 24. *Act.* vers. 22.

that the Greek word (b) ἀνωθεν is the same thing as to the sense, as these other words in the fourth verse ἐκ νεότητος, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, from my Youth, from the beginning: He adds only, that the word ἀνωθεν, or *ab initio*, must not be joyn'd with the Verb that immediately precedes it, as it seems to be in the Vulgar, but with the following Verb *vixi*. Indeed an able Critick who is well vers'd in the style of the Sacred Books will be induc'd to annex *ab initio* to *vixi* even in the Vulgar.

It is worth the while to observe by the way, that the ancient *Latin* Interpreter generally Translates the Greek word for word, and leaves them in the same order as they are express'd in the Original; he hath here observ'd this method, and hath moreover literally render'd the particle ἐπὶ, by *quoniam*, which is not *causal* in this place, but a simple *quod* *that*, as in divers other passages; and therefore these words which are contain'd in the Vulgar, *præscientes me ab initio quoniam secundum certissimam sectam nostra Religionis vixi Phariseus*; answer to these, *præscientes me ab initio secundum vixisse Phariseum*.

In the First Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 7. vers. 37. they declare in their Note, that they have follow'd the Greek Text and the judgment of St. *Jerom*, rejecting that which is found in the Vulgar, as if it were not conformable to the Greek: It is true, that this passage of St. *Paul* is obscure, and that being concise, it may be explain'd after different manners; however, this does not hinder but that the words of the Greek Original may be very well express'd in the Vulgar. There were wanting some words in the ancient *Latin* Edition which was re-establish'd by St. *Jerom*, when he corrected it by his Greek Copies: Now it is not entirely to follow St. *Jerom* to depart from his Edition, tho' he might indeed Translate this same passage after another manner, in Writing against *Jovinian*.

They have Translated in Chap. 10. of the same Epistle, vers. 13. according to the ordinary Greek, *Vous n'avez eu encore que des tentations humaines, you have as yet had only human temptations*; and take notice at the same time, that it is read in the Vulgar, *I could wish that none but human temptations might happen unto you*. But it were more expedient in my opinion to retain in the Text of the Version the reading of the Vulgar that is confirmed by the ancient *Latin* Fathers, and by the old Edition which was in use before it was rais'd by St. *Jerom*; this Learned Critick did not reform it in this place, according to his Greek Copies; and it is probable that the ancient Interpreter read in his Greek Text εἰληφέτω, as the Marquess *de Velez* has found in one of his MSS. However, this does not hinder them from intimating in a Note that the ordinary Greek seem'd to be more genuine than the *Latin*.

(b) Ἀνωθεν, id est ab initio, ut rectè vetus, vel jam inde ab initio, ut τὸ ἀνωθεν non multum discrepet à vocibus ἐκ νεότητος & ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in superiore versu. Joann. Boys, ibid. ad c. 26. Act. vers. 23.

They have likewise adher'd to the present *Greek* in vers. 19. of the same Chapter, and have inserted the reading of the *Vulgar* in the Margin. But all the difference that there is between the *Greek* Text and the *Latin* Edition, consists only in a Transportation of the words, which are express'd in the ancient *Greek* MSS. after the same manner as in the *Vulgar*.

In the 12. Chapter of the same Epistle, where they have Translated, *chacun de vous en particulier en est un des membres*, every one of you in particular is one of the Members; they have prefer'd the ordinary *Greek*, before that which is express'd in the *Vulgar*; nevertheless the ancient Interpreter only render'd the reading of his *Greek* Copy, in which there was the word *μέλεις*, as the Marquess *de Velez* hath found in one of his MSS. it was likewise read in the old Edition before the time of St. *Ferom*, *ex membro*, neither hath this Father alter'd the former reading according to his *Greek* Copies: Therefore it were more convenient to preserve in the Version of *Mons*, that which is contain'd in the *Vulgar*.

They have likewise Translated conformably to the present *Greek* in Chap. 15. of this same Epistle, vers. 5. *puis aux douze*, afterward to the Twelve, observing at the same time in their Note, that *Eleven* is found literally in the *Vulgar*, but that the *Greek* hath the *Twelve*, which was the name of the Apostolical College; and to this purpose they cite St. *Augustin*. But would it not be more judicious to retain the ancient reading of the *Vulgar*, since they undertook to Translate the *Latin* Edition, and not the ordinary *Greek*? It is certain that the ancient Interpreter read in his Copy *ἐνδεκα* *Eleven*, as it is Written in the most ancient *Greek* MSS. The word *undecim* was also express'd in the old Edition that was us'd before the time of St. *Ferom*, and hath retain'd it in his Correction, which likewise ought to have been done by these Gentlemen in their Translation, it were sufficient to mark the reading of the ordinary *Greek* in a distinct Note.

Forasmuch as this defect, whereof we have even now produc'd divers Examples, is generally obvious throughout the whole Version of *Mons*, it were needless to insist any longer thereon. It is certain that the method observed by the Translators of *Port-Royal* is not exact, and that they have rather consulted the modern Interpreters, especially the Protestant, than the Primitive Ecclesiastical Writers. They have not sufficiently reflected on the ancient Version of the Western Churches. In a word, their Translation is rather the Work of some young Student that has perus'd certain Commentaries on the New Testament, than of a learned and judicious Person, who hath thoroughly applied himself to the Study of the Critical Art, and of the style of the Sacred Books: Moreover they seem to have recourse rather to the decisions of *Beza* and *Estius*, than to the ancient Records that justify our *Latin* Edition.

Not that we are of Opinion as to this matter, that the most ancient Readings, were always the most true and genuin; for the contrary hath been

been prov'd on several occasions; but we maintain that they have not done Justice to the Interpreter of the Church; since they have abandon'd him (without any necessity) in an infinite number of places, to adhere to the ordinary *Greek*, as if there never had been any other *Greek* Text than that which is contain'd in the common Editions, or in the modern Translations that have been taken from it. Lastly, the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* are so very exact in describing the differences between the *Greek* and the *Latin*, that they frequently take notice of a variation even in those places where there is really none.

Can we allow the practice of an Interpreter of the Bible; who after having undertaken to Translate the *Greek* Version of the *Septuagint*, should from time to time, without any reason, alter and correct it according to the *Hebrew* Text of the *Jews*? The same thing may be affirm'd concerning the Translators of *Mons*, who have engag'd to publish a *French* Version of the *Latin* Edition, as it is read throughout all our Churches, and nevertheless after-times render the *Greek* Text, and even such a one, as is different from that according to which the ancient *Latin* Edition was compos'd.

C H A P. XXXVII.

A Discussion of the Principal Reasons produc'd by the Gentlemen of Port-Royal to justify the method which they have observ'd in their Version of the New Testament.*

A Considerable part of the preceding Objections has been already oppos'd to the Translators of *Mons*, but after so irregular a manner, that any one would be apt to believe in reading their Vindications, that they had right on their side; for the consequences that have been inferr'd from their Principles, are generally so remote, that they might easily take an occasion to retort the Accusations of their Adversaries; Nay they sometimes seem even to overthrow them by the forces of their Arguments, and by a great number of Quotations alledg'd in their behalf.

However, it might be justly objected to them, that having had a design *Request do* to Translate the *Latin* Edition into the Vulgar Tongue, they ought not *Mr. P Arch* in divers places to suppress the Text of the Vulgar, or to Transplant it *d' Amb. n. 62.* in the Margent, and to prefer the *Greek* before it: But they have proceeded very much too far in affirming that the Vulgar ought always to be esteem'd beyond the Originals, and that it is by no means lawful for private Persons to compose Versions from them.

The

The Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* had reason to prove by the Testimony of many Catholick Authors, and those too for the most part Jesuits, that the Council of *Trent* by declaring the Vulgar to be Authentick, hath not diminished any thing of the authority of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Originals; but can they prove from thence that a Translator who has profess'd to follow the Vulgar, may be permitted to depart from it to adhere to the *Hebrew* or *Greek* Text? This is really the matter in debate, and not to know in general whether the Bible may be Translated from the Originals. The example of *P. Veron*, who hath in some passages prefer'd the *Greek* before the Ancient *Latin* Edition, cannot justify their proceedings; for it is an apparent fault, as hath been above-shewn in discoursing concerning the Version of this Father.

Moreover, to what purpose do the Apologists of *Port-Royal* appeal to the *French* New Testament of *Mr. de Marilles*, to the *Italian* of *Brucciali*, and to the *Latin* of *Erasmus*? Have not these Interpreters plainly declar'd in the very beginning of their Works, that they Translated it from the *Greek* and not from the *Latin*? As therefore they have adher'd as much as possibly they could to the *Greek* Original, which they continually had before their Eyes; so in like manner the Translators of *Mons* who have propos'd to themselves to turn the *Latin* Edition into *French*, ought to follow it every where exactly, and never to lose the prospect thereof.

If *M. Arnaud* intended to imitate *Erasmus* whom he cites as an Example, he ought not to depart from the Vulgar in his Translation, as this Learned Critick did not believe that it was lawful for him to abandon the *Greek* Text which he render'd; altho' he were persuaded that this *Greek* was less exact in some places, than the *Latin* of the Vulgar; he is content as often as this happens, to take notice thereof in his Notes, which ought likewise to have been done by the Translators of *Mons*: It was only requisite to describe the variations of the *Greek* in the Margent, and they might also declare their Opinion touching those passages, where they determin'd that the *Greek* was more genuin than the Vulgar. Not to report what has been said elsewhere, we need only to consult the 21th Chapter of this Work, wherein mention is made of *Erasmus's* method.

R. c. sur la
Req. de Mr.
l'Arch. d'Am.
n. 67. I know not what these Gentlemen mean in their Remarks on the Request of *Mr. the Arch-Bishop of Ambrun*, by a *Spanish* Version in the Vulgar Tongue which was compos'd from the *Hebrew*. Who hath condemn'd (say they) a certain *Spanish Bible in the Vulgar Tongue, which is altogether Translated from the Hebrew*? I am very much mistaken, if these Learned men have not taken a *Jewish Bible Printed at Ferrara* for a Catholick Translation.

The reasons produc'd by *Mr. Arnaud* in vindication of the Version of *Mons* against *Mr. Mallet*, which are only a repetition of those that these Gentlemen have already alledg'd in their former Apologies, sufficiently prove that a Translator may well be allow'd to make a Version of the

the New Testament from the *Greek* Original, but they do not justify the method of those of *Port-Royal*, as has been even now demonstrated; nevertheless let us examine the allegations of this Doctor, who assures us, that they who undertook the Translation of the New Testament printed at *Mons*, did not maintain any private Opinion with respect to the *Vulgar* and the *Greek* Text; but that in this as well as in all other matters they agreed with the common sentiments of all the able *Roman Catholick* Divines.

*M. Arnaud's
New Vind. of
the N. T. of
Mons against
Mr. Mallet.
Book 1. Ch. 1.*

He endeavours to prove this by the express words of their Preface, which he cites, and thereupon makes this reflection, *They testify thereby* *Id. ibid.* *that they follow'd the judgment of the most eminent Doctors of the Church, who have determin'd that they ought to avoid these vicious Extremities, by which some persons have suffered themselves to be misled in the beginning of the last Age. For there were some, especially among the Hereticks, who imagin'd that in all the places where the Greek was different from the Latin, there was an apparent fault in the Latin, and that it ought to be corrected by the Greek. And there were others on the contrary, who thro' an ill grounded zeal for the Latin Edition, maintain'd that on these occasions, which are very frequent, there was always an alteration in the Greek, and that it ought to be amended by the Latin; whereas the most Learned among the Divines and Interpreters of the Holy Scriptures have been content only to assert, that the Greek was not so pure a Spring, that it should always be taken for a certain rule to esteem every thing as a fault that shall be found to vary from it in the Vulgar, as was pretended by some Hereticks: But they have likewise avouch'd at the same time, that it cannot be affirm'd that it was corrupted every where, that is to say, in all those places where it differs from the Latin.*

Indeed there is nothing in this Opinion but what is extremely judicious, and we must do so much justice to the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* as to acknowledge that they are Orthodox therein, and that they have adher'd to the judgment of the most able Divines in the *Roman Catholick* Communion. But I do not apprehend how they can infer from thence, that they had reason to compose a *French* Version of the New Testament, in which now and then they follow the *Latin*, at another time the *Greek*, and even sometimes neither, according as they shall judge to be most convenient. I desire them to shew that they have therein imitated *Bellarmin*, and all the other illustrious Authors cited by them on this occasion. None of these Divines ever determin'd that an Interpreter who undertook to Translate the Bible from the *Vulgar*, might insert in the body of his Version (especially since the *Latin* Edition hath been corrected by the Censors of *Rome*) the readings of the Original, transferring at the same time those of the *Vulgar* to the Margent, and even sometimes suppressing them. This is plainly the matter in debate, and not whether there are any places in which the Originals ought to be prefer'd before this *Latin* Edition. The Protestants shew more prudence in the Versions of the Bible publish'd by them, than the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have done

in their Translation of the New Testament: Forasmuch as the former solely adhering to the Original, which they profess to Translate and retain a constant Uniformity, that ought to be observ'd in Works of the like nature; Whereas the Translators of *Mons* have not had regard to any.

Mr. Arn.
Ibid.

Of all the able Divines cited by Mr. *Arnaud*, there is none that comes nearer to his *Idea* than *Salmeron*; therefore he often alledges his testimony, and undertakes to confute his Adversaries by the Authority of this Learned Jesuit. *The method* (says he) *that has been follow'd in this Translation, with respect to the Greek Text, and the Vulgar is approv'd in express terms, by one of the most able Divines of the Society, who having assisted in the Council of Trent, understood, without doubt, what they meant when they attributed the name of Authentick to the Latin Edition. It is Salmeron, &c.*

Salm. Prol. 3.
de Canon
Script. &
Germ. Biblio.
Edit.

This passage is found in his Third Prolegomenon, where he declares (according to the quotation of Mr. *Arnaud*) *That it is lawful, without infringing the Authority of the Council of Trent, to alledge that which is found to be different from the Vulgar in the Greek or Hebrew Copies; to consider and explain it as being the real Text of the Bible; to make use thereof, not only for the edification of good manners, but also to establish and confirm the Doctrines of Faith; and to extract solid Arguments from thence, as from the Text of the Holy Ghost.* These are indeed the words of *Salmeron*, but there is nothing hitherto that can justify the method of the Translators of *Mons*. For he discourseth of the Commentators on the H. Scriptures, and not of the Interpreters, as may be prov'd by the example of *St. Jerom*, which is produc'd by him in the same place, and intended to shew, that an able Commentator on the Sacred Books, ought carefully to examine the words of the Original, and of the Vulgar, as this Learned Father hath done in his Commentaries on the Writings of the Prophets, where, after having explain'd the *Hebrew* Text, in those places where it is different from the *Latin* Version of the *Greek Septuagint*, which was the *Vulgar* of that time, he represents the literal Sense. *Ita enim* (says he) *sæpe Hieronymus facere consuevit, qui in Commentariis super Prophetas, post explicatam lectionem Hebraeam variam ab illa Lxx. Interpretum, literam persequi solet.*

Ibid.

Let us now proceed to enquire, whether the following words may be more favourable to the Translators of *Port-royal*; they are thus Translated by Mr. *Arnaud*: (a) *If it happens at any time, that we find one thing*

(a) *Si quando contingeret ut aliud legamus in Vulgarâ & Latinâ Editione, aliud verò in Hebraicis aut Græcis codicibus, si non contradicunt, sed tantum sunt diversa, utraque lectio est recipienda & catholico sensu explicanda. Si verò contradicant sibi invicem, sicut affirmatio & negatio, quod perrarum esse solet, adhibenda est diligentia & omnis opera ponenda, si quâ ratione illa possimus ostendere in speciem tantum & non reipsâ sibi adversari — Ubi verò nulla possit iniri concordia, illi lectioni magis esset standum, quæ magis cum præcedentibus & sequentibus consonaret, aut quæ magis conveniret cum Apostolicis & Evangelicis Literis, aut quæ antiquiora & probatiora exemplaria pro se haberet, aut quæ à pluribus Patribus agnita est & probata, sive sit Hebræa, sive Græca, sive Latina. Salm. Prol. III. de Can. Script. & germ. Bibl. edit.*

in the *Vulgar*, and another in the *Hebrew* or *Greek Text*, if they are only different and not contrary, both must be admitted; But if the matters contradict one another, as the affirmative and the negative (which very rarely occur) all possible care ought to be taken to shew, that the contrariety is only in appearance, and that there really is none: But if they cannot be reconcil'd, of those various readings, we must prefer that which hath a greater coherence with the preceding and following, or that which is more conformable to the *Evangelical Doctrine*, or that which is establish'd by more ancient and authentick Copies; Or Lastly, that which is allow'd by a greater number of the *Primitive Fathers*, whether it be *Hebrew*, *Greek* or *Latin*.

It cannot be denied that these are the express words of *Salmeron*, as appears from the *Latin Quotation*, which I have subjoyn'd in the *Margent*. *Altho' the Translators of Mons* (adds *Mr. Arnaud*) *should have design'd to take their measures from this passage of Salmeron; nevertheless they could not observe the three Rules of this Jesuit more exactly than they have done.* Mr. Arh. Ibid. This he endeavours to prove on the account that these Gentlemen, wheresoever they found a difference between the *Greek* and the *Latin*, without any manifest contrariety, have included within two Crochets with the Letter V. or G. that which is redundant in the *Vulgar*, more than in the *Greek*, or in the *Greek* more than in the *Vulgar*, and have thereby intimated, that they receiv'd both with due respect.

But forasmuch as it hath been already demonstrated to them, that in the most part of those places where they have annexed these marks V and G. there is no variation between the *Greek* and the *Latin*; How can it be affirm'd by them, that they have imitated *Salmeron*? It was requisite for them to prove, that this Jesuit acknowledg'd no other *Greek Text* of the *New Testament*, but that which is comprehended in the ordinary Editions; and this they will never be able to do.

Moreover, *Mr. Arnaud* Declares, that they have again follow'd *Salmeron*, in regard, that when the different Readings in the *Greek* and in the *Latin*, seem to be contrary, they endeavour to adjust them. But the example that he produceth of this pretended accommodation, is an evident corruption of that which is contain'd in the *Greek* and *Latin Text*, as hath been prov'd in the preceding Chapter, wherein we have shewn, that the Translators of *Mons* have express'd in Chap. 8. of *St. Matthew*, Vers. 30. neither the *Greek* nor the *Latin*, under pretence of reconciling them.

Lastly, that which is added by this Doctor, that when there appears any contrariety which cannot be accommodated, these Gentlemen have insisted neither on the *Greek*, nor on the *Latin*, but have preferr'd that of the two which bears the greater mark of Truth, and that they have therein also imitated *Salmeron*, cannot be true; since they have inserted the *Greek Text* in their Version, and transferr'd the *Vulgar* to the *Margent* in divers places, without any necessity, and even sometimes not very judiciously, which this Jesuit would never have done.

Salm. *ibid.*

But after all, the Opinion of *Salmeron*, and the Judgment that he give concerning the Vulgar, and the Original of the H. Scriptures, have no relation to the *Idea's* of the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*. This prudent Jesuit explains in that place, the Decree of the Council of *Trent*; that had preferr'd the ancient *Latin* Edition before all the other Versions, without making any mention of the Original Texts of the Bible; and which had at the same time ordain'd, that this ancient Translation should be corrected with all possible exactness, *Voluit* (says he) *præterea Sancta Synodus ad hanc Latinam Editionem amplectendam, & in omnibus consecrandam nos arctare, non quidem simpliciter, sed dummodo esset a vitiis quæ in eam irrepsissent, & ab omnibus mendis & erroribus emaculata atque repurgata.* But this Reformation was not as yet accomplish'd by the Popes; and he wisheth that it might be done with all possible expedition, to the end, that the *Latin* Bible being thus amended, might be us'd as a certain Rule throughout all the Western Churches.

Therefore it is not to be admir'd, that he thought fit that it should be Corrected in many places, since the Council of *Trent* had already given Orders for the performance thereof. The Criticks at that time had all the liberty imaginable to exhibit those Readings which they believ'd to be the most Genuine. We find a considerable example of this practice in the *Latin* Bibles publish'd by the Divines of *Louvain*, who were of Opinion, that they put the Decree of the Council of *Trent* in execution, when they caus'd to be Printed an Edition of the Vulgar, with a very great number of various Readings; Moreover, the Critical Notes of *Lucas Bruggensis*, which were set forth before the correction of *Sixtus V.* are also an eminent proof of the freedom that was then allow'd in reforming the Vulgar.

The Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* cannot avouch that they have follow'd in their Version the example of these famous Men, in regard that since that time the *Latin* Edition hath been establish'd in a fixed State, by the Popes *Sixtus V.* and *Clement VIII.* Private Persons are no longer permitted to revise it, serving only in their Notes, where they may freely deliver their conjectures on those passages which they shall judge as yet to stand in need of a Reformation: Wherefore, since they had propounded to themselves, to Translate the New Testament from the Vulgar, they ought every where exactly to adhere unto it.

Neither can they reasonably urge the example of *Salmeron*, who presupposeth in express terms, that the Council of *Trent* has Declared, that the Vulgar should be Corrected; and (b) who ardently desires, that the Re-

(b) *Utinam labor in eâ expurgandâ & recognoscendâ inchoatus per-peculiarem Illustrissimorum Cardinalium atque doctissimorum virorum deputationem à Sanctissimo D. A. Pio. V. indictam tandem aliquando perficeretur! Itæ enim fieret ut Latinam Bibliorum Editionem genuinam & germanam magno cum totius Ecclesiæ & studiosorum utilitate brevi habere-mus.* Salm. *ibid.*

formation which was already begun at Rome even in his time, were finish'd, to the end that by this means there might be extant a faithful and exact Edition of the *Latin Bible*. He adds that during the interval of time, which should be spent in preparing this Edition for the Press, now was prohibited to rectifie the manifest Errors of the Vulgar from the *Hebrew* or *Greek Copies*, or from the readings of the Fathers; or in fine, according to the general rules of the Art of Critick, *Interim dum Salm. ibid. hæc in lucem prodit, nemo vetat quin apertos errores ex Hebrais vel Græcis Codicibus, vel ex variâ veterum Patrum lectione, vel ex constanti & aperta ratione corrigere atque emendare valeamus.*

After this, I shall leave it to the judgment of the whole World to determine, whether Mr. Arnaud had reason to affirm, that the Version of *Mons* be perfectly conformable to the rules prescrib'd by *Salmeron* for the correction of the Vulgar. Nevertheless he cites no Author of greater repute than this Jesuit, whom he always calls to his assistance, more especially when he declares in another place, that *the true method which ought to be observed is that of Salmeron*; and it is this, *Not to admit any general rule that may oblige us always to prefer the Latin before the Greek, or the Greek before the Latin; but only to adhere to the truth, by chiefly esteeming in those passages where these two Texts cannot be reconcil'd, that which hath the most apparent marks of having retain'd the purity of the Apostolical Original.* This Doctor hath not consider'd that *Salmeron* only applied his rule to the state of the Vulgar, as it remain'd before it was revis'd by the Censors of Rome, and that he has explain'd his meaning very clearly as to this matter, by making use of the word *interim*, as we have even now shewn.

M. Arnaud's
New Vind. of
the Version
of the N. T.
Printed at
Mons. Book
1. Ch. 13.

Mr. Arnaud argues more rationally when he proves by the authority of *Bellarmin*, and many other Learned Writers, that the Vulgar is not at present so exact, nay even since the Reformation of the Popes, but that some defects may as yet be discovered therein. And indeed this hath been acknowledg'd by the Censors themselves in their Preface inserted at the beginning of the Bible of *Clement VIII.* But if the Translators of *Mons* intended to imitate these Famous Men, they ought to leave in the Vulgar these small defects which they did not think fit to remove: It were sufficient to intimate in the Margent that the *Greek Text* appear'd to them in certain places to be more Correct than the *Latin*.

However, I do not believe that for practising the contrary, they have incurr'd the penalty express'd in the Bull of Pope *Clement VIII.* wherein it is forbidden under pain of the greater Excommunication reserv'd to the Holy See to Print the Vulgar otherwise than after the same manner as he had Corrected it; nevertheless in regard that the design of this prohibition was to prevent the reading of any other Bible than that throughout all the Western Churches; the Translators of *Mons* ought entirely to conform themselves to the purport thereof, since they undertook to Translate the Vulgar.

Mr.

Mr. Arn.
ib. ch. 4.

Mr. *Arnaud* has ingenuously declar'd that the prohibition of this Pope does not extend to the New Translations; especially in the Vulgar Tongue; and that it is an extravagancy altogether peculiar to Mr. *Mallet*, to maintain, that it is thereby forbidden to insert any thing therein that is consonant to the Originals, when they differ from the ancient *Latin* Edition: But he will never be able to cause his method to be approv'd by those persons that have any skill in Critical Enquiries. Common Sense requires that a continual Uniformity ought to be observ'd in a Translation of the Bible; and therefore the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, having profess'd in the very beginning of their Work, that they intended to represent the Vulgar in *French*, they ought exactly to follow that which is called by this name: For all the difference that there is between the Vulgar in *Latin* and the Vulgar in *French*, consists only in this, that the later is a *French* Copy of the former. It is likewise probable that one of the principal Reasons that caus'd the Translation of *Mons* to be censur'd at *Rome*, is that the Authors thereof having promis'd in the Title of their Book to exhibit the Vulgar, have nevertheless apparently departed from it in many places. Forasmuch as these Versions in the Vulgar Tongue are chiefly compos'd for the use of those persons who do not understand the *Latin*, we ought to deliver into their hands the *Latin* Edition, after the very same manner as it is read in the Church.

I desire no other testimony to convince the Translators of *Mons*, that they have acted contrary to good sense in their Version, than that of *Erasmus*, *Beza*, and other able Criticks, who have Translated the New Testament from the *Greek*. Forasmuch as they were persuaded that it was requisite to maintain a constant Uniformity in their Work; they have so scrupulously adher'd to the *Greek* Text, that they have even follow'd it in those places where it did not appear to them to be exact; neither have they admitted the *Latin* of the Vulgar into the Text of their Versions; but have only observ'd in their Notes, that it ought to be prefer'd before the *Greek* in those places. These Interpreters have had no other rule in making choice of this method than their own discretion.

This same discretion ought also to regulate the proceedings of the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, so as to induce them to adjoyn nothing to the Text of their Version but what agrees with the *Latin* Edition which they have render'd. If they were desirous to make any remarks on the variations between the *Greek* and the *Latin*; they should be refer'd to their Notes. In this point they would have imitated the able Commentators of the *Roman* Catholick Communion, who carefully describ'd these differences, and even sometimes esteem the *Greek* beyond the *Latin*, without designing on this account to make any alteration in the Text of the Vulgar: Therefore Mr. *Arnaud* does not argue well when he justifies the method of the Translators of *Port-Royal* by the example of these judicious Commentators, because a distinction must be made between Versions and Commentaries.

ib. ch. 5.

This

This Learned Man is to be commended for taking the part of *Erasmus* *ib. ch. 8.* against Mr. *Mallet*, and for vindicating his Translation of the New Testament, whereto the Inquisitors themselves have found nothing to object. It were only to be wish'd that Mr. *Arnaud* had appear'd to be as good a Critick as *Erasmus*, and that he had imitated him in his method, then we should not have discover'd so many imperfections in the Version of *Mons.*

Moreover he had reason to affirm that altho' the Translations of *Geneva* were compos'd by Hereticks; yet they are not to be rejected as Erroneous, and that there can be no inference drawn from thence, that they ought not to be imitated. But that which cannot be approv'd in the Version of *Port-Royal*, is, that they have sometimes adher'd to them in certain places where they are remote from the Vulgar: Moreover it is not expedient for those who profess to exhibit a Version of the Vulgar, to follow the Example of Interpreters that Translate from the *Greek* Text. It is not to be denied that we may be assisted by having recourse to the Translations of the Bible that have been made by Hereticks; but it ought to be done with greater judgment than the Translators of *Mons* have shewn on this occasion.

There is no judicious Person that would not willingly admit with Mr. *Arnaud* this Critical rule taken from the Writings of St. *Augustin*; that *when there happens to be any variation in the Copies of the Holy Scripture, the greater number ought to be prefer'd before the lesser, and the more ancient before those that are of a later date.* But it may be easily prov'd to these Gentlemen, that they have not carefully observ'd their rule; for they have sometimes esteem'd the lesser number of Copies, and those of little Antiquity, rather than the greater quantity, and the more Ancient.

Mr. Arn.
New Vind.
of the Tran-
slation of the
N. T. Prin-
ted at Mons.
Book 3. Ch. 3.

Furthermore, this rule ought not to be applied at this day, to the various reading of the MSS. after the same manner as in the time of St. *Augustin*, by reason that the *Greek* Copies according to which the ancient Vulgar was compos'd, are become extremely scarce, especially since the New Edition of St. *Jerom* prevail'd over it, as I have elsewhere prov'd; and therefore it cannot be affirm'd with the Translators of *Mons*, that a matter is absolutely contain'd in the *Greek* Text, because it is found in the ordinary *Greek*, and even in the most part of the MSS. It is requisite besides this, to shew that it was extant in the *Greek* Copies, from which the ancient *Latin* Interpreter extracted his Translation.

I desire no other Example to confirm this truth than that which is propounded by Mr. *Arnaud*. This word *au jeûne* to *Fasting* is inserted with the Letter G. in the Version of *Mons*, in the 1. Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 7. Vers. 5. as if the Vulgar were not conformable in that place to the *Greek* Text; whereupon he cites the MSS. that were consulted in preparing the Edition of the New Testament printed at *Oxford*, and that of *Curcellens*, as also the MSS. of St. *Stephen*, those of the *Marquess de Velez*, and some others; from whence he concludes that since there are but four Manuscripts quoted by *F. Amelote* that agree with the

the Vulgar, and there being on the other hand above sixty that vary from it, the word *Fasting* ought to be read (according to these later,) in this place of *St. Paul*.

This Doctor always takes to the Contrary part; for the question is not to know whether there are 60 *Greek* MSS. in which the word *Fasting* is included, but only whether the Author of the Vulgar found it in his *Greek* Copy. Now it is evidently prov'd by the MS. of *Clermont*, and by that of *St. Germain des Prez*, wherein it is not express'd, that the ancient Interpreter hath not actually read it in his *Greek* Original. It is to no purpose, that Mr. *Arnaud* produces the Syriack, Arabick, and some other Versions, since the matter in debate is only concerning the Vulgar, and the *Greek* Copies from which it was taken. Whensoever he undertakes to Interpret the *Greek* Text, he may be allow'd to follow those *Greek* Copies which he shall think fit chiefly to approve; But in Translating the Vulgar, he ought not to represent to us an improper *Idea* of this Version, as he has done in declaring that it is different from the *Greek* in many places, where nevertheless it only varies from the common Editions of the *Greek* Text, and not from the *Greek* Copies according to what it was compos'd.

If he had known the qualifications of these ancient MSS, he would not have affirm'd that the word *Fasting* is contain'd in the Copy of *St. Germain des Prez*: However, it is not included neither in the *Greek* nor in the *Latin* of this ancient MS. no more than in that of *Clermont*, which is kept in the King's Library. These two MSS. exhibit to us the ancient Vulgar Edition together with the *Greek* Text to which it was conformable. These sorts of MSS. were heretofore as common as those that we now call Vulgar. The Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* not having sufficiently applied themselves to this kind of study, would have done more prudently in simply Translating the Vulgar, after the same manner as it was corrected by the Censors of *Rome*, than in filling their Translation with unprofitable Notes, which are also very frequently false.

Moreover, it doth not appear that Mr. *Arnaud* hath had a true *Idea* of the Vulgar Edition, when he affirms that there are certain infallible proofs to shew, that it hath not remain'd in the same state as it was establish'd by *St. Jerom*, and when he makes these proofs to consist herein, That this Father Declares in divers passages of his Works. That it was requisite to Correct some things in it according to the *Greek*, which are not as yet alter'd. If the *Latin* Edition had been Reform'd after this manner at *Rome*, it would be no longer the Vulgar. *St. Jerom* hath himself observ'd, that he forbore to Revise many places of this Ancient Edition of set purpose; and it is not to be admir'd that he corrects that in several passages of his Works, wherein he is more accurate.

Another considerable defect in the Version of *Mons.* is, That the Authors thereof have rather follow'd the Explications of Commentators, than the Text which they undertook to Translate. This is plainly insinuated

nuated by Mr. *Arnaud* in his Answer to Mr. *Mallet*, in which, to vindicate these Translators, he often hath recourse to the Aphorisms of Divinity, as if in a Version of the H. Scripture, it were absolutely necessary to adhere unto the Theological Expositions of the Fathers. *There is no Rule* (says this Learned Man) *of greater importance throughout the whole course* *Id. ib. Lib. 7. Chap. 3.* *of Divinity, than that whereby we are inform'd, that being oblig'd to consult the H. Fathers, as the Depositaries of the Tradition of the Church, to find out the true Sense of the Sacred Books, if they appear not to be entirely unanimous, either in regard that some of them have been more enlighten'd than others; or by reason, that all have not discours'd with equal exactness, we ought chiefly to cleave unto those, who having written since the appearing of any Heresie, have more diligently applied themselves to search out in the H. Scriptures, those places which establish the Truths that have been oppos'd by these Heresies, and whom God seems more especially to have rais'd up to defend the Faith of the Church against the Efforts of her Enemies.*

This whole Discourse tends only to shew that the Theology of St. *Augustin*, with respect to Grace and Predestination, ought to be prefer'd before that of the *Grecian* Fathers; and that therefore the Apostles should be introduc'd, speaking according to the sentiments of this Father, which are suppos'd to be those of the Catholick Church. Forasmuch as in this work I do not profess to perform the Function of a Divine, or a Casuist; I shall not undertake to examine, whether the Theology of St. *Augustin* may be esteem'd beyond that of the *Grecian* Fathers, and even of all the Eastern Churches: It is sufficient to observe in general, that this Maxim of Mr. *Arnaud* cannot be admitted in a Translation of the New Testament, wherein we are oblig'd carefully to follow the very words of the Text, without restraining it to any particular Sense, altho it were that of St. *Augustin*.

There is a great deal of difference between the Theological Sense, and that which is call'd Grammatical or Literal; and a Translator ought always to have regard to the later; otherwise every one will be apt to take the liberty of Translating the H. Scriptures, conformably to his Theological Notions, and then it will be no longer to interpret the Word of G O D, but to explain it according to the particular *Ideas* of private persons. Therefore it is not expedient to prefer in a Version of the Sacred Book, the Theological Sense of one Father before that of another, saving only when this Sense is Consonant to the Grammatical or Literal. But since there is no necessity of insisting any longer on these general Reflections, let us proceed to a particular discussion of the Translation of *Mons*, and of the Notes that are annex'd to it.

C H A P. XXXVIII.

An examination of some particular passages of the Version of Mons, and of the Notes that relate to this Translation.

IT is sufficient to have observ'd once in general, that the Translation of *Mons* is full of *Phrases* and superfluous words, that ought to be admitted only in a Commentary; any one may easily perceive this defect, as being obvious throughout the whole Work: As for example, it may soon be discover'd, that it is requisite to render these words in the Epistle to the *Romans*, Chap. 8. v. 39. *Neque altitudo, neque profundum*, as they are inserted in their Note; *Ni la hauteur, ni la profondeur*, neither height nor depth, whereas we read in the Text of the Version, *Ni tout ce qu'il y a au plus haut dans les cieux, ou en plus profond des enfers*; Neither all that there is in the highest Heaven, or in the uttermost bottom of Hell. These sort of expressions are found almost every where in the room of simple words.

However, we must do so much justice to the Translators of *Mons*, as to acknowledge, that they determin'd by this abundance of words, more clearly to express in divers passages, the energy and propriety of certain Greek terms, especially those that are call'd Compound. But they are frequently mistaken, because these Compound words signifie no more in the greater part of those places than the simple. Therefore their too nice exactness, when this happens, cannot be a sufficient reason to justify their departing from the Vulgar. The Learned Dr. *John Boys* has judiciously remark'd this defect in the *Latin* Version of *Beza*, who hath sometimes Translated, even to the very Etymologies.

In Chap. 9. of *St. Matthew*, v. 36. where we read in the Greek Text *ἐσπλαγχνίσθη*, and in the Vulgar, *Miseratus est*; it is render'd by the Translators of *Mons*, in imitation of him, *Ses entrailles furent émuës de compassion*; *His Bowels were mov'd with compassion*. These Gentlemen without doubt, intended by this phrase, more emphatically to express the efficacy of the Greek Verb, which they have likewise done in many other places where it occurs: But Father *Amelote* hath simply Translated with the Vulgar, *Put compassion, had compassion*.

Dr. *Boys* could not approve the practice of *Beza*, who under colour of rendring this Greek Verb more exactly, hath also Translated, *Commiseratione intima commotus est*: He condemns this sort of Interpretations, as being too exquisite a manner of criticizing, which ought rather to be inserted

serted in the Notes, than in the Text of a Version, *Anxia illæ* (says he) Jo. Boys
& penè dixeram superstitiosæ interpretationes, quæ veluti minima mansa in os Col. lat. vet.
inferunt, ut mea est sententia, scholiis sive annotationibus multo aptius quàm Int. cum rec.
contextui ipsi convenerint. ad c. 9 Mar.
 v. 36.

The Translators of *Mons* had reason, according to this Maxim, to Translate in Chap. 8. of St. *Matth.* v. 16. *commanda*, he commanded, because it is read simply in the Vulgar, *imperavit*, altho the Verb *ἐπιτιμασθαι* in the Greek, usually signifies *to command with threats*. They are content only to make mention of this Interpretation in their Note; which they ought likewise to have done in the other places, to retain a constant Uniformity. But they sometimes express in the Text of their Version (without any necessity) the etymology of the Greek words, which is not the part of a judicious Interpreter.

Thus in Chap. 25. of St. *Matth.* v. 34. where it is Printed in the Vulgar, *possidete*, they have Translated *possédez* [*G. comme vostre heritage*] *posseds as your inheritance*, adding these words, *as your inheritance* between two Crochets, with the Letter *S.* as if they were wanting in the Vulgar, and were included only in the Greek Text; nevertheless, the Verb *κατανομισητε* was render'd literally by *possidete*. Thus *Erasmus* and *Beza* have likewise retain'd it in their Translations in this place, however, the later hath Translated in Chap. 5. of St. *Matt.* v. 5. *κατανομισητε* by *hereditario jure obtinebunt*, and the former, by *hereditatem accipient*. Dr. Boys taking the part of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, who hath simply render'd *possidebunt*, rejects these two other Interpretations, as being more proper to be inserted in a Dictionary than in a Version made by Learned Men. *Quid opus* (says he) *tam multis? Lexicographis & Ludimagistris studio sit vocabulorum originationes expendere curiosæque tradere. At bonis & eruditis Interpretibus non convenit fortasse tam anxia diligentia.* This he proves by the example (a) of the Verbs *οικοδομεῖν* & *δινοχεῖν* which signifie simply *to build*, and *to pour out*; Moreover, he adds, that the Verb *κατανομιεῖν* imports nothing else but *to possess* in many passages of the *Septuagint*. He also produces as an example, that of St. *Matthew*, Chap. 25. v. 34. where the most judicious Modern Translators have render'd simply with the Vulgar, *possidete*.

I desire no other example to convince the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, that they ought not to express in their Version, the etymologies of the Greek words, than their Note on Chap. 9. of St. *Mark* v. 6. where we read in the Vulgar, *facta est nubes obumbrans eos*, and in their Translation,

(a) *Ut οικοδομεῖν ναυὸν est ædificare navem. & δινοχεῖν ὕδωρ, fundere aquam: sic κατανομιεῖν γῆν, possidere terram: nec aliter sonat apud LXX. Interpretes multis in locis.* Joann. Boys, Collat. vet. Int. cum rec. ad c. 5. *Matth.* v. 5.

il parut une nuée qui les couvrit, there appear'd a Cloud which cover'd them. They have made the following remark on this passage, viz. That they did not think fit to Translate *obumbravit, qui les couvrit de son ombre, which cover'd them with its shadow* (because this Cloud (say they) was full of Light as is declar'd by St. Matthew;) Nevertheless this is the signification of the Greek Verb *ἐκσκέδασεν*, which is literally render'd in the Vulgar by *obumbro*, if we may judge thereof by the Etymology or Propriety of the word, but it denotes simply *to cover*. This shews that the Translators of *Mons* ought not so easily to abandon the ancient Interpreter in many other places, where he renders the sense of the Greek Original no less accurately, altho' he does not express the Etymologies of the words.

According to this method it was requisite to Translate in Chap. 7. of the Revelation, vers. 15. *shall dwell over them*, conformably to the Vulgar, where it is read *habitabit super eos*; whereas they have Interpreted, *leur servira luy-même de tente pour les couvrir, he himself shall serve as a Tent to cover them*. They observe in their Note; that the Vulgar hath *habitera sur eux, shall dwell over them*, as if the ancient Latin Interpreter had not exactly render'd the Greek Verb *κατασκήσεται*: It may be affirm'd on the contrary, that he has Interpreted it as a Learned Man, and not like a School-Boy, as the Gentlemen of Port-Royal and F. Amelote have done, together with Beza, who hath likewise in his Latin Version *proteget eos umbraculo*. But Erasmus and Arias Montanus have Translated according to the Vulgar, *habitabit super illos*, and Castalio *apud eos deget*. Cassiodorus Reyna, Cyprian de Velera, and the Author of the Spanish Version printed at Venice in the year 1556. have Translated *morara entre ellos, shall dwell among them*, preferring the ancient Latin Version before that of Beza. There is also in the Translation of Geneva, *habitera avec eux, shall dwell with them*. He that publish'd a new Edition thereof at Paris, Annon Dom. 1669. whom I believe to be Mr. Daille the Younger, hath alter'd it in that place (with little judgment) according to the Interpretation of Diodati.

The Translators of *Mons* seem to have had no other design in their Notes than to expose the Author of the Vulgar, as an Interpreter that was little exact, and who had not very properly render'd the Greek words. Thus in Chap. 10. of St. Luke, Vers. 2. where they have Translated, *Qu'il envoie des ouvriers, That he would send Work-men*; conformably to the Vulgar, they add in their Note, that it is in the Greek, *Qu'il pousse & fasse aller, That he would thrust forth and cause to go, extrudat*. It is true indeed that Erasmus hath Translated the Greek Verb *ἐκσκέδασεν* in that place by *extrudat*, and the Ministers of Geneva *qu'il pousse*. But these Interpretations, which perhaps are too Grammatical, do not hinder, but that that of the Vulgar, wherein we read *mittat*, may be very literal. We find also in the Latin Version of Arias Montanus, Castalio & Beza *emittat*, and in the three Spanish Translations above-cited, *que embie, that he would send*; neither is it otherwise express'd in the Syriack and the Arabick.

These

These Gentlemen are so clear-sighted, that they can discover such things in the *Greek* Text as were never found therein, as in Chap. 24. of *St. Luke*, Vers. 16. where they have Translated *leurs yeux estoient retenue* [*G. par une vertu divine, their Eyes were retain'd [by a divine virtue:]*] as if these words included between two Crochets were only contain'd in the *Greek* Original; nevertheless there is no variation thereupon between the *Greek* and the *Vulgar*, nor even between the *Greek* Copies.

That which has misled them, is, that they have read the *Greek* only in certain Versions, or rather Commentaries on the New Testament. Now many of these Commentators, and among others the Protestants, have observ'd that this was done by a Divine power, *ita nimirum statuente Domino*, says *Beza* in his Note on this passage, where he also takes an occasion to establish a point of Controversie, on which it is not necessary here to insist. I am very much mistaken, if the Translators of *Mons* have consulted any other *Greek* Original than the Note of *Grotius*, who after having render'd the *Greek* Verb *ἐνεστέοντο* by *tenebantur* according to the reading of the *Vulgar*, explains it by these other words, *impediebantur vi divinâ*: This apparently induc'd them to Translate, *were retain'd* [*G. by a divine virtue*] altho' these last words are not extant in the *Greek*, nor in any Version.

In Chap. 15. of the Epistle to the *Romans*, vers. 26. and 27. where the word *ἐνδοκίαν* is twice us'd in the *Greek* Text, and in the *Vulgar* *probaverunt & placuit*, they have Translated in both these places, *ont résolu avec beaucoup d'affection, resolv'd with a great deal of affection*, imagining that the *Latin* Interpreter hath not well express'd the force and propriety of the *Greek* Verb *ἐνδοκέω*. Indeed it is intimated by *Beza* that this word signifies somewhat more than that which is in the *Vulgar*, that is to say, a certain testimony of affection, *Vulgata* (says he) *ad verbum* pro-
baverunt; *sed aliquid amplius videtur hoc verbo significari, nempe cum ultro*, ad c. 15.
& ex bonitate quadam alacri benè volumus cuipiam, aut rem aliquam probamus. Epist. ad
Rom.

The Translators of *Mons* might likewise have observ'd the same thing in a distinct Note, following at the same time in their Version the Text of the *Vulgar*, wherein the *Greek* Verb is literally express'd, which usually signifies *to think fit, or to think convenient*. Wherefore *Erasmus* and *Castalio* have Translated in this place, *visum est*. *Arias Montanus* hath retained *probaverunt & placuit*. We read likewise in the *Italian* of *Diodati* *è piaciuto*, in the *French* Translation of *Geneva* *il asemblé bon* it seem'd good, and according to the same sense in the *Spanish* of *Cassiodorus* *Reyna* and *Cyprian de Valera* *tuvieron por bon*; Lastly, in the *Spanish* Edition Printed at *Venice* in the Year 1556. *ha parecido*: Insomuch that the Criticisms of the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* are seldom approv'd, when they depart from the *Vulgar*, under pretence of rendering more exactly the words of this Edition with relation to the *Greek* Original.

The same thing hath befall'n them in Chap. 6. of the 11. Epistle to the *Corinthians*, vers. 14. where instead of interpreting simply with *F.*

Amelote,

Amelote, ne vous joignez point aux infideles, be ye not joyn'd with Unbelievers. they have Translated with a long circuit of words, after their usual manner, *ne contractez point une alliance* [G. *inegale*] *en vous attachant a un même joug avec les infideles, do not contract an alliance* [G. *unequal*] *by bearing the same Yoke with the Infidels.* They have inserted in the Text of their Version, that which they read in the Commentaries. For to express the Sentiments of Beza (who hath render'd, *ne impari iugo copulami*, and who affirms in his Note, that the Greek Participle *ἑταροζυγῶντες* denotes certain persons that being in a different condition, nevertheless assist one another in the same Work) they have included betwixt two Crochets [G. *unequal*] and have likewise Translated, *by bearing the same Yoke.*

But the Interpretation attributed by Budeus to the Greek Verb *ἑταροζυγῶν* which he explains by *ἑταροζυγῶν*, and which was even produc'd by Beza, is more natural, and perfectly agrees with our Vulgar. It hath been follow'd in like manner by Grutius, who could not find the word *Unequal* in this Greek Verb, as the Translators of Mons have done in imitation of Beza. He also confirms his Opinion by the reading of the ancient Syriack Interpreter *ἑταροζυγῶν* (says this Learned Critick) *est alteram partem jugi trahere, id est, idem jugum subire; Quare Syrus hic dixit, Ne sitis filii unius jugi cum iis qui non credunt.* These Gentlemen are not always successful, when they prefer before our Latin Version the Criticisms of Beza, to which the other Divines of Geneva have had no regard in this place, for they have simply Translated, *Ne vous accouplez point avec les Infideles*, being content only to exhibit the other Interpretation in the Margent, which is that of Beza. Diodati hath likewise inserted in his Italian Translation, according to the same sense, these words, *non v'acoppiate congl' Infideli*, and hath added this Note, which confirms the reading of the Vulgar. *Grec. Non vi mettete sotto un medesimo giogo, o non tirate ad uno stesso giogo, do not put your selves under the same Yoke; or do not draw with one and the same Yoke* In fine the three Spanish Versions that were compos'd from the Greek, do also agree with our Vulgar: Moreover we read in that of the Year 1556. *No tray gays yuga con los infieles*, and in the two others, *no os yunteys en yugo con los infieles.*

It often happens that they give judgment concerning the readings of the Greek Original, with respect to the Versions and Commentaries that they have perus'd, rather than according to the Text it self, as in Chap. 10. of the 11. Epistle to the Corinthians, vers. 7. where they have Translated conformably to the Vulgar, *jugez au moins des choses selon l'apparence, you judge at least of things according to the appearance.* They declare in their Note, that it is express'd in the Greek, *do you not judge of things only according to appearance?* However, it is certain, that without altering the Greek Text, the ancient Interpreter might Translate as he hath done by not placing the point of Interrogation after the Verb

ἐλάμπει, as indeed it is not * in the Greek Edition printed at the Louvre; In fol. 1642. in that of Simon de Colines, in that of Oxford, nor in some others.

In Chap. 5. of the Epistle to the Ephesians, vers. 13. where they have Interpreted with Beza, *n'y ayant que la lumiere qui decouvre tout, there being nothing but light that discovers every thing*; they have observ'd in the Margent, that it is literally in the Vulgar, *every thing that is discover'd is Light*. It may be easily believ'd in reading this Note, that the Vulgar Translation is not consonant to the Greek Text; nevertheless, Erasmus, Castalio, and Arius Montanus, who Translated from the Greek as well as Beza, do exactly agree with the ancient Latin Interpreter; for the first hath render'd, *quidquid manifestum redditur lumen est*; the second, *quidquid patet lucidum est*; and the third, *omne manifestatum lumen est*.

That which hath given occasion to this diversity of Interpretations, is the different acception of the Greek word *τὸ φανερούμενον*, which might be Translated either actively or passively *manifestat*, or *manifestatur*. Beza and some others have adher'd to the former sense; but the above-nam'd Translators have follow'd the other, together with the ancient Interpreter Erasmus, who has taken notice of these two significations, insists very much on the former, by reason of the Article *τὸ*, which is included in the Greek. However it may be, they represent a false Idea of the ancient Latin Version, who affirm, that the Author thereof hath not express'd the sense of the Greek Text, in a place where he agrees with the most judicious Interpreters that have Translated from the Greek. There is a great number of other passages of the like nature in the Version of Mons, wherein those Translators, have mark'd with little judgment a difference between the Greek Text, and the Latin of the Vulgar, altho' there is not really any.

They are also accus'd of having frequently added in their Translation the word *Efficacy*, which they imagin'd to be apparent in the Greek Text, to the end that the term *effectual Grace* might be read in the New Testament. But they have replied to this objection, that their adversaries have so great an aversion to effectual Grace that they hate the very name thereof, and that they cannot endure that it should be found in the Holy Scriptures. This is Mr. Arnaud's answer to Mr. Mallet; the former of whom, affirms, that the Greek word *ἐνεργεῖν* being express'd in those places, they had reason to render it *to act effectually*. They maintain (says this Doctor) *that it is the true signification of this Greek word, and that it does not denote only to act, but also to act with efficacy*.

But without engaging in the dispute between these two Doctors, may it not be objected to Mr. Arnaud, that he professes to Translate the Latin of the Vulgar and not the Greek Text? Now there is nothing of this efficacy in the Latin, and there are many who cannot discern it in the Greek. Is it lawful for a Translator who hath propos'd to himself to interpret the Vulgar in French, to depart from it in those places that he shall judge to be favourable to his prejudicate Notions? Ought not an able

M. Arnaud's
New Vind. of
the Version
of the N. T.
Printed at
Mons. Book
9. Ch. 9.

able Interpreter, (as hath been already observ'd) to retain an Uniformity in his Version? However, let us examin in particular, whether the Gentlemen of *Port Royal* had reason to abandon the Interpreter of the Church in those places, under colour of exhibiting a more proper Sense of the *Greek Verb ενεργειν*.

It is certain that this word does not signifie of it self, and always, to act or work with efficacy, as may be prov'd by the testimony of the most expert Criticks in the *Greek Tongue*; nay, even the Translators of *Mons* ought to concur in this, since they themselves have interpreted it in divers places of their Version, without adding the word efficacy; therefore we must be guided by the circumstances only, in determining where it is requisite to be added; and in my opinion it were more expedient, even in those places, to imitate the *Latin Edition*, which was taken from the *Greek*, many ages before the Controversies that have been debated in these later times, with a great deal of Animosity concerning effectual Grace.

The first passage in which I find the word efficacy added, without any necessity in the Version of *Mons*, is in Chap. 2. of the Epistle to the *Galatians*, v. 8. where they have Translated, *celuy qui a agy efficacement dans Pierre*; he that hath acted or wrought effectually in Peter. It is read in the *Greek* ὁ ενεργῶν Πέτρῳ, and in the Vulgar, that expresseth the *Greek word* for word, *qui operatur est Petro*. *Castalio* hath likewise render'd, *qui in Petro egit*. And *Cyprian de Valera* in his *Spanish Version*, *el que hizo*, according to the same Sense. I cannot take it ill that *Erasmus* and *Beza*, who undertook to Interpret the *Greek* and not the *Latin*, have render'd, *qui efficax fuit*, by reason that the *Greek Verb* may admit this Sense; altho they had no reason to abandon the ancient Interpreter.

The same thing cannot be affirm'd with respect to the Translators of *Mons*, who ought much less to depart from the *Latin Edition*, since they were engag'd to follow it; besides, that is an ill practice to insert two words in a Translation, when there is but one in the Original, at least, if there were not an extreme necessity to do it. Now I desire no other example, to prove that there was no occasion to add the word efficacy in that place, than the same expression which is found in Chap. 3. of this Epistle, ver. 5. where we read in the *Greek* ενεργῶν δουλεύειν ἐν ὑμῖν. and in the Vulgar, *qui operatur virtutes in vobis*. The Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have likewise Translated simply, *qui fait des miracles parmy vous*; who worketh miracles among you.

Why have they not added the word *efficacement*, effectually, as they have done elsewhere? *Beza* hath render'd *efficit* that signifies somewhat more then the Verb *operatur*, which is read in the Vulgar, and in the Translation of *Erasmus*, who hath not observ'd a sufficient Uniformity therein. There appears also more of a capricious Humor, than of a solid Judgment in that of the Doctors of *Geneva*, who have Translated in Chap. 2. of this Epistle, *celui qui a bosogné avec efficace par Pierre*, he that simply

hath wrought with efficacy thro' Peter, and in this passage celui qui produit les vertues; He that produceth Powers or Miracles. Diodati is not more Uniform in his Italian Version, having interpreted in the former passage, bavare efficacemente operato; and in the second, simply opera.

I know not why the Gentlemen of Port-Royal have not in like manner Translated in Chap. 5. of the same Epistle, Ver. 6. *Faith that works effectually by Charity*; for it is written in the Greek *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ενεργουμένη*. Forasmuch as they aim at an extraordinary exactness in expressing the Greek words, they have inserted in their Translation, *la foy qui est animée de la charité; Faith that is animated by Charity*, and in their Note; *agissante par la charité; working by Charity*. In my Opinion, this later Interpretation, which answers to the Greek word, would have been more conveniently plac'd in the Text of the Version, than in the Margent. But they had read in the Commentaries of *Esthius*, who is one of their most approv'd Authors, that the sense of this passage was, *fides per charitatem animata*.

It must be confess'd nevertheless, that the Translators of *Mons* do not always follow *Esthius*; for if there were any place throughout the whole *New Testament*, where they ought to add the word *efficacy*, it is this in Chap. 1. of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, ver. 11. where this Divine affirms, that (b) the Greek Verb *ἐνεργεῖν*, whereof St. Paul makes use in that place, signifies an efficacious operation, and that the sense of this passage is, That God effectually works our Salvation and Justification, as he works all things; that is to say, by a proper and physical causality. It is likewise imprudent (according to his judgment) to maintain the contrary, as some Learned Men have done. However, it is read simply in this place in the Version of *Mons*, according to the Vulgar; *ayant esté predestinez par le decret de celui qui fait toutes choses selon le dessein de sa Volonté; Being predestinated by the Decree of him who worketh all things according to the design of his Will*. But they ought to Translate conformably to their own Principle and the Doctrine of *Esthius*, *qui fait efficacement, who worketh effectually*; or to speak more plainly, since the word *effectually*, was not inserted in this place, neither ought it to be express'd in the others, where it is added by them.

I would willingly know for example, What reason they had to Translate in Chap. 3. of this same Epistle to the *Ephesians*, ver. 20. *qui agit en nous avec efficace, that worketh in us effectually*. Beza, one of the most constant maintainers of effectual Grace hath interpreted simply *agit*, and *Diodati* in his *Italian Version*, *opera*, conformably to the Vulgar. It is true indeed, that we find in the Translation of *Geneva*, which is sometimes

(b) Verbum Græcum ἐνεργεῖν, quo hic utitur, operationem significat efficacem. Itaque sentit Apostolus Deum efficaciter operari salutem & totam justificationem nostram, sicut universa operatur, nimirum causalitate physica seu proprie dictâ. Quid imprudenter a quibusdam aliqui doctis negatur. Est Comm. in c. 1. Epist. ad Ephes. v. 11.

transcrib'd by these Gentlemen, *qui besongne avec efficace en nous*, and in the correction of Mr. *Daille* the younger, *qui agit en nous avec efficace*, as in the Version of *Port Royal*.

In Chap. 2. of the Epistle to the *Philippians*, ver. 13. they have Translated according to the reading of the Vulgar, *c'est dieu qui opere en vous le vouloir & le faire*; It is God who worketh in you to will and to do. But as if the Greek Text were not thereby exactly express'd, they declare in their Note, that it is read in the Greek *ἐνεργῶν*, which signifies, who effectually produceth. *Beza* and *Esthins* discourse very much at large, in proving effectual Grace by this passage, and the later grounds his Notion on the Writings of St. *Augustin* and *Thomas Aquinas*, affirming that the other Fathers, even the *Grecian*, are of his opinion. (c) Moreover, he insists on the Greek word *ἐνεργῶν*, which imports, (as he says,) *to act with efficacy*.

I shall not here undertake to shew that the Doctrine of *Esthins* is not confirm'd by all the Fathers, as he avoucheth. However, the Translators of *Mons* have acted in this place with greater precaution than in the others, where they have inserted the word *efficacy* in their Version: They are content only to intimate in their Note, that the Greek Verb signified this of it self. Nevertheless, St. *Chrysostom*, who very well understood the Greek Tongue, and who had diligently studied the Stile of St. *Paul*, has observ'd nothing like it in this expression.

The Ministers of *Geneva*, who were not so scrupulous, have translated *c'est dieu qui produit en vous avec efficace & le vouloir & le parfaire selon son bon plaisir*; It is God that effectually produceth in you both to Will and to Do, according to his good pleasure. But *Diodati* being more cautious, hath render'd simply with the ancient Interpreter, *opera in voi il voler e l'adoperare, worketh in you to Will and to Do*. It is likewise express'd after the same manner in the three Spanish Versions, that were compos'd from the Greek Original *obra en vos otros el querer y el bazer*; without making any mention of efficacy. And therefore it cannot be true; that the proper signification of the Greek word *ἐνεργῶν* is, *who effectually produceth*.

The Translators of *Port-Royal* have not observ'd the same moderation in Chap. 1. of the Epistle to the *Colossians*, Ver. 29. where they have obtruded with *Beza* and the other Ministers of *Geneva*, the word *efficacy*, that is not extant in the Vulgar, where we read only, *certando secundum operationem ejus quam operatur in me in virtute*; which answers word for word to the Greek Text. Moreover, to the end that they might seem to be more exact, they have limited the sense of this passage, by supplying somewhat after this manner *combattant selon qu'il in assiste par sa vertu efficace qui agit puissamment dans moy, striving according as he assists me*,

(c) Postulat hoc Græcum Apostoli participium *ἐνεργῶν*, id est efficaciter agens. Unde manifestus est hic locus & irrefragabilis contra Pelagianos pro efficaci gratiâ Dei. Est. Comm. in c. 2. Epist. ad Philipp. ver. 13.

by his efficacious virtue which acts powerfully in me, which bind also to the same effect in the Version of Beza, *decertans secundum vim illam efficacem ipsius agentem in me potenter.*

These Gentlemen have again introduc'd the word *Efficacy* in their Translation, in Chap. 2. vers. 13. of the 1. Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, where they have Translated *la parole de Dieu qui agit efficacement en vous*, the word of God which effectually acteth in you. It is thus express'd in the Latin Edition, *Verbum Dei qui (quod in the ancient Vulgar) operatur in vobis*, as also in that of Beza, *Sermonem Dei qui etiam agit in vobis*; and in the three Spanish Translations *obra*. But we read in the Version of Geneva, *la parole de Dieu laquelle aussi besongne avec efficacy en vous*, the word of God which works with efficacy in you. Diodati hath likewise render'd, *opera efficacem.*

This want of Uniformity which appears throughout the Translations of the Calvinists is an evident proof that they did not believe that the Greek word *ἐνεργεῖν* signified of it self to act effectually. The ancient Interpreter of the Church is on the contrary, always Uniform in those places; having simply Translated the Verb *ἐνεργεῖν* by *to act*, or *to work*. The Translators of *Port-Royal* would have shewn much more prudence in imitating him, than in obtruding without any necessity, the word *efficacy* in their Version with the modern Interpreters. Indeed this might well be done in the Commentaries of *Estius*, according to the Theological notions of this Author, in regard that we are not oblig'd to be so exact in a Commentary as in a Translation of the Holy Scriptures, in which nothing ought to be admitted (as far as it is possible to judge) but what is apparently the word of God.

I doubt not but that these Gentlemen have some reasons whereby they maintain this different manner of Translating the same word, in one and the same Book; but it were more expedient to declare them in their Notes, than to add to the New Testament that which very many persons cannot find therein. If they affirm that they have had regard to the sense, we may reply, that it is extremely dangerous to introduce into the Holy Scripture a sense concerning which all people are not agreed, especially if it have any relation to Divinity.

We find for example less to object, on the account that they have Translated in Chap. 2. of the 1. Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, vers. 7. the word *ἐνεργεῖται* by *se forme* is form'd, whereas in other places they have interpreted it by *to act* effectually. They undoubtedly believ'd together with the Doctors of Geneva, who have render'd *se met en train*, is in agitation; that it was the sense of this passage; nevertheless it were more requisite to Translate according to the Vulgar, and even with Beza, *doth operate*, or *act*. They might have exhibited the other sense in their Note in imitation of Diodati, who hath interpreted conformably to the Vulgar *opera*, adding at the same time this remark, *perche gia del suo tempo si cominciavano a porre i fondamenti casi de gli errori come della tirannia*, that even

in his time the foundation of errors began to be laid, as that of tyranny. If there be any error in this explication, at least he cannot be accus'd of having inserted it in the Text of the New Testament.

Lastly, the word *efficacy* is so acceptable to the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* that it is found again in their Version in vers. 11. of the same Chapter, where we read, *Dieu leur enverra un esprit d'erreur si efficacy, qu'ils croiront au mensonge*, God shall send them a spirit of error so efficacious, that they shall believe a lie. This expression is somewhat more pathetical than those words of the Vulgar, *mittet illis Deus operationem erroris, ut credant mendacio*. However the ancient Interpreter hath every where retain'd an absolute uniformity in rendering the words *ἐνέργειαν* and *ἐνέργεια*. The Translators of *Mons* have observ'd in their Note, that it is literally an efficacy of Error. Beza hath likewise Translated *efficacia erroris*, and for the more clear explanation of his meaning, he adds in his Note, that it is a most efficacious power to deceive them; whence he concludes, that the Divines of the Roman Catholick Communion are very much mistaken in setting so great a value on the injunction of their Church. *Id est* (says this Calvinist) *vim quamdam in illis decipiendis efficacissimam. Eant nunc sophistæ, & Ecclesie sua prescriptionem nobis objiciant*.

Far be it from me, that I should attribute this same notion to the Translators of *Port Royal*. Mr. Arnaud hath very well observ'd in justifying the passage which is now in debate, *That it is with respect to the Text of the Sacred Book, that we ought to judge whether a Translation be good or bad; It is to make use of very ill means*, (continues this Learned man) *to delude the Ignorant, to cause them to abhor the interpretation of a passage of the Holy Scriptures, only on the account that some Hereticks have Translated it after the same manner*.

However to make good his argument, it is requisite for him to shew, that the word *ἐνέργεια* in the Greek Text, necessarily signifies efficacy, which he will scarcely ever be able to prove; for first the ancient Interpreter, who usually adheres to the Letter of his Original, and by whom he ought rather to be directed than by the modern Translators, hath never render'd it in that sense, having us'd the word *operatio*. Moreover the Syriack and Arabick Translations, which he cites as consonant to that of *Mons*, are not altogether favourable to his Opinion. It is true, that the word *efficacia* is read in the Latin of those two Oriental Versions; but *ܡܠܟܐܢܐ* in the Syriack, and *مملكة* in the Arabick are absolutely the same thing as the Latin word *operatio*, which is express'd in the Vulgar. Therefore the determination of Mr. Arnaud is only confirm'd by certain Translators of these later times, who have frequently abandon'd the ancient Latin Edition without any apparent necessity.

Moreover there is somewhat to be deducted from the number of these modern Interpreters cited on his behalf; for Erasmus and the Abbot de Marolles must not be reckon'd but as one and the same, since the later professeth to Translate into French, the Version of the former. He is likewise

likewise mistaken when he placeth a Bible of *Lyons* in the rank of the *Roman Catholick*, for it is a *French Translation* made by *Calvin*, which was Reprinted at that place.

As for the *French Bible* of *Antwerp* it cannot be produc'd to this purpose, since it is read therein conformably to the *Vulgar*, *Dieu leur en-voiera operation d'erreur*, *God shall send them an operation of Error*: And if we find in the *Margent efficace de seduction*, *an efficacy of delusion*; it is because the *Authors* of this *Version* have sometimes mark'd the reading of the *Greek Text*, which they took from that of *Erasmus*, rather than from the *Original*. It is also requisite that those *Gentlemen* should be content after their example to insert this interpretation in the *Margent* in form of a *Note*, and then those would be a much less ground of objection, it being certain that many *Commentators* have attributed this sense to the *Greek word*.

Furthermore, the *Translators* of *Mons* have not only reform'd the ancient *Latin Edition*, but they have also presum'd to correct the *Text* of *St. Paul*, under pretence of rendering it more conformable to the *Originals* of the *Scripture*. It is well known to all the *World*, that in citing any passage of the *Old Testament*, he generally follows the *Version* of the *Septuagint*, which was in use throughout all the *Primitive Churches*, and even among the greater part of the *Jews*: Moreover he sometimes thinks fit to alledge the sense rather than the word. But these *Gentlemen* seem to be offended at the practice of this *Apostle*, and that he hath prefer'd a *Version*, which is not altogether exact, before the *Hebrew Original*.

It is on this account that in *Chap. 9.* of the *Epistle* to the *Romans*, *vers. 27.* they have Translated *Il n'y en aura qu'un petit reste de sauvez*, *only a small remainder of them shall be sav'd*, observing in their *Note*, that this is the sense of the *Hebrew* and the *Syriack*, and that the words of *St. Paul* signifie literally, *the remainder shall be sav'd*. But to what purpose is the *Hebrew* and *Syriack* introduc'd here when the matter in hand is to Translate a passage of the *Prophecy* of *Isaiab*, after the same manner as it is exhibited in the *Greek Text* of this *Apostle*?

Moreover, why do they tell us that they have adher'd to the sense of the *Hebrew* and *Syriack*, since there is not the least difference in that place between the *Greek Text* of the *LXX Interpreters* that was follow'd by *St. Paul*, and the *Hebrew* to which the *Syriack Version* is conformable? We find *רש* in the *Original*, and *רש* in the *Syriack*, which words signifie *the remainder*, or as it is in the *Vulgar*, *reliquia*; neither does the *Greek Noun* *ὑπόλειμμα*, which is express'd in this passage of *St. Paul*, and in the *Septuagint*, denote any thing else; That which hath misled the *Gentlemen* of *Port-Royal*, being oftentimes an occasion of error to them, is that they have only consulted the *Commentators*, who have understood by this remainder, *a small remnant*. *Sola tamen ex eo reliquia*, (says *Estbinius*) *id est paucissimi salvi erunt*.

Est. Comm. *Esth* hath likewise serv'd them as a Guide in the following verse, in c. 9. *Ep.* which they have Translated from the *Hebrew*. This Doctor having observ'd that St. *Paul* hath cited the passage of *Isaiah*, according to the Greek of the LXX. Elders, adds afterwards, that it ought to be explain'd as it is extant in the *Hebrew*, which is thus render'd by St. *Jerom*: *Catrum exponenda hæc sunt ex Hebræo, ubi sic legitur Hieronymo interprete, &c.* Forasmuch then as the word λόγος contain'd in the Greek Text of St. *Paul*, conformably to the *Septuagint*, and express'd in the Vulgar by that of *Verbum*, is not found in the *Hebrew*; *Esth* declares that no regard should be had thereto. *Cum igitur* (says he) *in Hebræo nulla sit verbi mentio, non est hic vocabulum illud peculiariter expendendum.* Therefore the Translators of *Mons* have in like manner excluded it from their Version, having Interpreted according to the Idea of this Divine, *Car Dieu dans sa justice consumera & retranchera son peuple*, for God in his justice shall consume and cut off his people. They have at the same time added in the Margent, that it is literally read in the Vulgar, *Car le Seigneur consume & abrega la parole en enquitè*; For the Lord consummates and abbreviates the word in Equity. Strange weakness!

Beza, who durst not presume to substitute in his Version the words of the *Hebrew* Text, in the room of the Greek, of the *Septuagint*, and of St. *Paul*, is content only to recite in his Note this passage of the Prophet *Isaiah*, as it is included in the *Hebrew* Bible, and to declare, (d) That the LXX Interpreters have not well render'd the Original; that St. *Paul* nevertheless had reason to make choice of their Translation, because it was then in use among those to whom he wrote; and that besides, as to the sense, with respect to that which he intended to prove, there was but little difference between the Greek and the *Hebrew*. If the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* had made any remark like unto this, retaining at the same time in imitation of *Beza* the words of St. *Paul* in their Version, they might have been more easily excus'd.

Moreover they have taken too much liberty in Chap. 11. of this same Epistle, vers. 8. for instead of Translating as it is read in the Greek Text of St. *Paul*, and in the Vulgar, *Dieu leur a donné un esprit d'assoupissement, des yeux pour ne point voir, & des oreilles pour ne point entendre, jusques à ce jour*, God hath given them a spirit of slumber, Eyes that they should not see, and Ears that they should not hear, unto this day. They have inserted in their Version, *Dieu leur a donné un esprit d'assoupissement, & d'insensibilité, & il ne leur a point donné jusqu'à ce jour des yeux pour voir, ni des oreilles*

(d) Ex collatione reipsa nemo inficiari potest Græcos Interpretes negligenter admodum quod ad voces ipsas attinet, hunc locum convertisse. Quod si quis roget, cur nihilominus Apostolus eâ interpretatione sit usus, respondeo merito id illum fecisse, cum ad eos scriberet qui versioni illi assueverant. Et quod ad sententiam ipsam attinet, cui confirmanda Paulus hoc testimonium adhibuit, Græci Interpretes eam satis integram servarint. *Bez. Annot. in c. 9. Epist. ad Rom. vers. 28.*

pour entendre, God hath given them a spirit of slumber and insensibleness, and he hath not given them unto this day Eyes to see, nor Ears to hear.

If it be demanded what reason they had to change the words of the Apostle in this place, we find this justification of their proceedings in a Note. *That which is inserted in the Text is supposed to be the most probable, and to have been taken from Deuteronomy, Chap. 29. vers. 4.* But altho' we should admit this with *Esthins*, who is their great Author, is it lawful to alter the words of *St. Paul* to render them agreeable to that which is read in the Book of *Deuteronomy*? Besides it is not certain that this passage was taken from thence; *Grotius* who understood the style of the Sacred Writings much better than *Esthins*, positively assures us, that these words are extracted from Chap. 6. of *Isaiah*, vers. 10. *Deprompta hæc* (says this Learned Critick) *ex Esaje 6. 10.* But from whatsoever place they may be produc'd, how far shall we run if it be once allow'd to correct the Quotations of the Evangelists and Apostles by the Books from which they were collected?

According to this false *Idea* the Translators of *Mons* have presum'd to reform the Text of the Acts of the Apostles, Chap. 2. vers. 20. *St. Peter* pronouncing a discourse which he directs to the *Jews*, cites the words of the Prophet *Joel*, after the same manner as they are extant in the *Greek* Version of the *LXX.* Interpreters. But these Gentlemen imagining that it was otherwise express'd in the *Hebrew* Original, have made no difficulty to correct the Quotation of *St. Peter* by this *Hebrew* Text. For instead of Translating with *F. Amelote*, *le grand & glorieux jour*, the great and glorious day, as it is read in the *Greek* and in the *Vulgar*; they have inserted in their Version *le grand & terrible jour*, the great and terrible day, and have added in their Note, that this is the sense of the *Hebrew*, as also of the *Greek* word *ἐμπανής*; as if it were design'd to Translate the *Hebrew* Text of the Prophet *Joel*.

But after all, if the Translators of *Port-Royal* were expert in the true knowledge of the *Hebrew* Tongue, they would not avouch that there is any difference between the *Hebrew* & *Greek* in that place. For the *Hebrew* word which is interpreted in the *Septuagint* *ἐμπανής*, and by *St. Jerom* *horribilis*, may be render'd after both these manners, as may be prov'd by many places of the Holy Scriptures, in which it is found. Wherefore *Grotius* hath judiciously remark'd in his Note on this passage of the Acts, that the word express'd in the *Hebrew* Original of *Joel* is very well Translated by *ἐμπανής* in the *Greek*, and *manifestus* in the *Latin* of the *Vulgar*, this he confirms by divers examples.

C H A P. XXXIX.

Other Examples of the defects that are apparent in the Translation of Mons, and in the Notes.

IT does not appear that the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* had recourse to the *Hebrew* Original, when they Translated in Chap. 12. of *St. Matthew*, vers. 40. *Comme Jonas fut trois jours & trois nuits dans le ventre de la baleine, as Jonas was three Days and three Nights in the Whales Belly.* We read in the *Greek* ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους, and in the *Vulgar*, in *ventre ceti*. Now it is certain, that this word signifies in general great Fishes as well in the *Greek* as in the *Latin*. Moreover, we find in the Original of the Prophet *Jonas*, from whence this passage was taken, *dag gadol*, that is to say, a great Fish.

The Observation made by Mr. *de Sassi* on this place of *Jonas* which he hath thus interpreted, *God caus'd at the same time a great Fish to appear*, is contrary to the Version of *Mons*. He informs us, that they who have treated of Fishes, as *Aldrovandus*, maintain that this fish was not a *Whale*, by reason that the Throat thereof is too narrow to be able to devour a man, but that it was a *Sea-Dog*, called also *Catcharias*, and *Lamia*. However it be, an exact Translator ought to retain in his Version the general word *Fish*, which is included in the Original, and in all the ancient Translations, as well of the Old as of the New Testament.

These Gentlemen who are very scrupulous in endeavouring to insert nothing in their Version but what is intelligible, have banish'd from thence certain words, which a continual use had as it were Canoniz'd. They have sometimes substituted in their room entire Phrases to explain the meaning of them; but they are not always successful in this sort of alterations, as appears from Chap. 23. of *St. Matthew*, vers. 5. We read in this place in the *Vulgar*, *dilatant phylacteria sua*; and in the Translations of *Louvain* and *Genova*, *ils elargissent leurs phylacteres*, they enlarge their *Phylacteries*, conformably to the *French Bible* of *Antwerp*, which is the Original of all the Versions in that Language.

The Translators of *Mons* who determin'd, that the word *Phylacteries* was not so sufficiently intelligible, as that it ought to be retain'd in their Version, have transferr'd it to the Margent, as being (in their opinion) too literal, translating the two words which are express'd in the *Greek* and *Latin* Text, by these, *Ils affectent de porter sur leur habits le paroles de la loy écrite dans des bandes de parchemin plus longues que les autres*; They affect to wear on their Garments the words of the Law written on scripts of Parchment,

Parchment, longer than those of other persons. These long scrolls of Parchment on the Apparel of the Jews, are Phylacteries, according to the mode of *Port-Royal*. But we have a very elegant description of them, made by *Leo Modinensis*, in his small Treatise concerning the Ceremonies of the Jews; neither were the Ministers of *Geneva* more exact in their remark on the word *Phylacteries*, where they intimate, that they were certain large borders on the bottom of their Robes, altho some ancient Writers seem to have been of this opinion.

*Leo Mod.
Hist. de Ri-
tib. Heb.
lib. 1. c. 11.*

If the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* had no conversation with the Jews, they ought at least to consult *St. Jerom*, who hath discours'd of these *Phylacteries*, with a great deal of Learning and Judgment. He deduceth their Original from these words of the Book of *Deuteronomy*, *Thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes.* *Ligabis ea in manu tua & erunt immota ante oculos tuos.* (a) The *Pharisees* (says this Learned Father) misinterpreting this passage, wrote the Decalogue of Moses on parchment, which they folded up and tied to their forehead, making a kind of Crown round their heads, to the end that they might have them always before their eyes. He calls a Crown two Thongs of Leather, with which the Jews were wont to surround their Heads, in the middle whereof was a sort of large knot, wherein the aforesaid parchment was included, which knot, being plac'd between both eyes, hung down almost to their Nose.

The Translators of *Port-Royal* are certainly too nice in excluding from their Version, the word *Phylacteries*, which *Erasmus* and *Beza* have retain'd in imitation of the ancient Interpreter, the later of whom has observ'd in his Note, that he was not willing to charge in his Latin Text this new word, which was invented by the Grecians, *Eas membraculas* (says he) *Græci novo nomine nova rei quasito vocarunt euanthēta a conservando, quod nos quidem immutare noluimus.* We read also in the three Spanish Versions above-cited *Phylacteria*, and in the Italian of *Diodati filatterii*, together with this explication in the Margent, *Parola Græca che significa conservatorii.* *Così erano chiamate quelle liste, bende o piastrelle di carta o d'altra materia sopra le quali si scriveva la legge di Dio, o parte di essa, e si legavano in su la fronte & in su le mani.* A Greek word which signifies Conservatories. Thus they call a certain List, Band, or Fillet, made with Paper or other Materials, on which the Law of God, or part thereof, was written and bound to their foreheads and hands. The Authors of the Annotations on the Old Bible of *Antwerp*, have likewise inserted this explanation in the Margent: *Phylacteries were certain bands which the Jews fasten'd to their foreheads and to their sleeves, wherein were written the Commandments of God.*

(a) Hoc Pharisei male interpretantes scribebant in membranis Decalogum Moysi, id est decem verba Legis, complicantes ea & ligantes in fronte, & quasi coronam capiti facientes, ut semper ante oculos moverentur. Hieron. Comm. in Matth. lib. 4. c. 23.

I should have nothing to object, in regard that they have interpreted in Chap. 26. of St. *Matthew*, Ver. 11. *vous ne m'aurez pas toujours*, *me ye shall not have always*; if they had been content to observe with *Beza*, that the Present Tense in the *Greek* Text, and in the *Vulgar*, is here taken for the future: But they refer in their Note to the *Roman Missal*, in which (as they say) it is every where read *habebitis* in the Future. The *Apologists* of *Port-Royal* confirm the Translation of *Mons* in several other places, by the readings of the *Missals* and *Rituals*, as if they had Translated those Books, and not the *Latin* Edition that remain in the heads of the people.

Moreover, they add in their Note, that in Chap. 5. Ver. 46. and Chap. 6. Ver. 1. of this Evangelist; the same Verb which is read in the Present Tense in the *Greek*, is explain'd by the Future in the *Vulgar*. *Beza* hath made the like remark in his Note on Chap. 26. of St. *Matthew*, Ver. 11. in which he hath render'd, *habebitis*; whereas we find *habetis* in the Version of *Erasmus*, conformably to the *Greek* Original, and the *Vulgar*, *Vulgata & Erasmus* (says this *Calvinist*) *ad verbum* *habetis*; *sed præsens pro futuro manifestè ponitur, sicut etiam supra, 5. 46. and 6. 1.* Indeed, the Present Tense is actually put instead of the Future in that place. But it were more expedient (in my opinion) to retain the Present in the Text of the Version, with *Erasmus* and the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, and to add the aforesaid Observation in the Note: By this means they would have imitated the most able Commentators on the H. Scripture, without departing from the *Vulgar*, which was propos'd to be Translated.

However, the Translators of *Mons* cannot be condemned on this account, as if they hereby intended to promote the Opinions of the Hereticks, since they have truly render'd the Sense, I could wish only that they had not endeavour'd to justify their Translation by the Oriental Versions, which are not favourable unto them. For whatsoever they may affirm, it is no otherwise express'd in the *Syriack*, than in the *Vulgar*, as well in the Gospel of St. *John*, as in that of St. *Matthew*. But the *Latin* Interpreter of the *Syriack* Version, who had more regard to the Sense than to the propriety of the *Syriack* word, hath Translated it *habetis*, which he hath likewise done in the Gospel according to St. *Mark*.

Besides, these Gentlemen ought to consider that they have cited the Oriental Versions only as they read them in the *Latin* Interpretations. This hath likewise hapned to them, when they maintain the ensuing Translation of Chap. 5. ver. 14. of the Epistle of St. *James*, *qu'il appelle les Pretres de l'Eglise, & qu'ils prient pour luy*; let him call for the Priests of the Church, and let them pray for him: as it is Printed in the first Edition of their New Testament. They establish their Version in this place on the authority of the *Syriack* and *Arabick*. The Authors (say they) of the *Syriack* and *Arabick* Translations, did not believe that there was any thing of very

*Vind. of the
Transf. of
Mons a-
gainst F.
Maimb.
12 pass.*

*Ibid. 4.
12 pass.*

very great moment in this manner of speaking, let them pray over him, since they have render'd, let them pray for him. It is true indeed, that we read in the Latin Interpretations of these two Versions, included in the Polyglott Bible, *pro ipso*. But the Syriack word *ܥܠܝܗ* and the Arabick (*عليه*) may be Translated indifferently *pro ipso* and *super ipsum*, because the Preposition *ʿl* signifies in these Languages *over* and *for*, as well as in the Hebrew. A judicious Man would conclude from thence, that altho it be written in the Greek *ἐν αὐτῷ*, and in the Vulgar *super eum*; yet it may very well be interpreted *for him*, according to the Language of the Apostles, who generally follow the Greek and the Septuagint.

It is difficult to approve their manner of Translating those passages where they insert in the Text of their Version, the different significations that may be attributed to one single word; since this practice may only be allow'd in a Dictionary, or at most in a Commentary. Thus in Chap. 12. of St. Matthew, ver. 29. where it is read in the Vulgar, conformably to the Greek; *intrare in domum fortis, & vasa ejus diripere*, they have render'd, *entrer dans la maison du fort armé, & piller ses armes & ce qu'il possède*: *enter into the house of a strong Man arm'd, and take away his Arms and that which he possesseth*. To justify their Transaction, they add in their Note *The word Vasa, or οὐκην according to the Hebrew so whi. h it answers, signifies Arms and Moveables*. It would certainly be a strange sort of a Version, if it might be permitted to introduce therein by way of Comment, the several significations that are appropriated to every word in the Dictionaries.

The exactness of the Translators of *Mons* is much to be admir'd; for they fill their Notes with minute circumstances, and make no remarks on the most important passages: They observe for instance, on Chap. 11. of the Revelations, ver. 16. where they have Translated *se prosternerent*; *they prostrated themselves*: that it is literally in the Vulgar, *they fell on their faces*, as if it were not thus express'd word for word in the Greek Text; besides that *to be prostrate, and to fall on ones Face*, is the same thing among the Eastern Nations. They would have done more judiciously in explaining the Word, *to adore or worship*, which is found in many places of the New Testament, and is equivocal; for it imports ordinarily, and in its Original, nothing else but to do reverence, by prostration after the manner of the People of the Levant.

In Chap. 5. of the Epistle to the Galatians, ver. 12. they have render'd those words *minam & abscindantur qui vos conturbant*, thus, *plust à Dieu que ceux qui vous troublent fussent non seulement circoncis, mais plus que circoncis*; *would to God that they which trouble you were not only circumcised, but more than circumcised*. But they have mark'd nothing in the Italick Character; insomuch that these words were not only circumcised, but more than circumcised; answer to the single Verb *abscindantur*.

It was requisite to Translate these words of Chap. 1. of St. John's Gospel, ver. 33. *hic est qui baptizat in Spiritu Sancto*, after this manner,

celuy qui baptise dans le St. Esprit, is he who baptizeth in the Holy Ghost, and not thus, *qui baptise par le St. Esprit, who baptiseth by the Holy Ghost*; as it is Printed in the Version of *Mons*; For the word *Baptize* in the *Greek*, signifies properly *to dip or plunge*. Therefore they had reason to correct their former Edition in Chap. 3. of *St. Luke*, ver. 16. where it was read, *je vous baptise avec de l'eau; I baptize you with water*.

The Translators of *Mons* have affected too great a niceness in removing from their Version certain terms, which might be stil'd consecrated; thus for instance, they ought to retain every where in their Version, the word *Testament*, which is found in the *Vulgar*, and answers to the *Greek διαθηκη*; they might also have explain'd it in a particular Note in those passages where it may bear this signification. As the Evangelists and Apostles have thought fit to make choice of divers terms of the *Septuagint* Version in their Writings, altho they might have us'd others that would have represented a more clear and distinct *Idea*, of the matters which they intended to express; so in like manner, Translators ought also to preserve in imitation of them, these same terms, which have been, as it were, Canonists in the Church by a continual use. But if it were necessary to supply any thing, it might be easily done in a distinct Note. It is sufficient that we have observ'd this in general, without producing a great number of particular examples. Let us now proceed to examine some passages of the Epistle of *St. Paul*, which have been more alter'd in the Version of *Mons*, than any other Book of the whole *New Testament*.

M. Arnaud's
New Vind.
of the Trans-
lation of the
N. T. Prin-
ted at Mons.
Book 2. c. 4.

Forasmuch as those Epistles are extremely difficult to Translate, these Gentlemen have likewise taken a very great liberty therein; nevertheless, if we may give credit to the asseverations of Mr. *Arnaud*, their Translation hath this peculiar property, that in it is so clearly illustrated the most difficult places, without departing from the literal Sense, that an infinite number of persons who were offended in reading the word of God, and especially the Epistles of *St. Paul*, by reason of the obscurity of the ancient Versions, do now peruse it with edification in that of *Mons*, on the account of the light which they find therein.

It is true indeed that we are more willing to read that which we understand, than that which we do not; and this is the cause that many have prefer'd the Translation of *Mons* before other Versions, which are not always sufficiently intelligible, especially in the Epistles of *St. Paul*. This also induc'd *Calvin* to revise the former version of the Ministers of *Geneva*, which being too literal was approv'd by few. This correction consisted chiefly in the mollifying of some words, and the addition of others, to render the Holy Scriptures more clear. *Beza* and *Diodati* follow this same method, in which they have had good success; but if it be acceptable to the common people who understand what they read in those Versions, it is no less offensive to judicious persons that cannot allow too great licentiousness in a Translation.

These

These first words of the Epistle to the Romans, Paul a Servant of JESUS CHRIST, exactly answer to the Greek and Latin of the Vulgar, but this Note which is added in the Margent otherwise a Slave, as if the word *Servus* might also signifie a Slave in this place, is remote from the intention of St. Paul, who took the name of Servant of JESUS CHRIST, as being his Minister and Apostle. It is in this sense that Moses and the Prophets are styl'd the Servants of God in the Old Testament, and in the same sense St. James, St. Peter, and St. Jude in the New Testament at the beginning of their Epistles call themselves the Servants of JESUS CHRIST, and not Slaves.

It were more convenient to Translate simply according to the Letter (as they have done in their Note) the 4th Vers. in Chap. 1. of this Epistle, than to insert in their Version, *qui a esté predestiné fils de Dieu dans une Souveraine puissance, who was predestinated the Son of God in a Sovereign power.* This word *Sovereign* which they have mark'd in the *Italick* Letter is not contain'd in the Text; and they have added it only to shew that St. Paul spake in this place concerning the Divine Nature of **JESUS CHRIST.** Mr. *Arnaud* hath prov'd by the Citation of a large *Mr. Arn.* passage of *Petavius's* Book, Entituled, *Dogmatar Theologiae*, that it is the *ibid. Book 1.* true sense of this Apostle; but an exact Translator should be very cautious in admitting into the Text of St. Paul the Explication of any Divines, concerning which all people are not agreed. *Chap. 5.*

The 9th Verse of the same Chapter is not well Translated in the Version of Mons. by these words, *Dieu que je sers par le culte interieur de mon esprit*, God whom I serve by the interior worship of my mind; since there is no mention in this place of worship, much less of an Interior Adoration, but simply of the Ministry of St. Paul. Therefore Erasmus, Beza, and Castalio, have too rashly abandon'd the Vulgar, wherein it is read *cui servio*, and which is follow'd by the three Spanish Versions, by Diodati, and by the Doctors of Geneva. The Gentlemen of Port-Royal have inserted in their Translation the Commentary of Esthim, who hath observ'd that the Greek Verb λατρεύω was usually taken in Holy Scripture, to signify the worship that is due unto God alone; Cui servio (says he) *Sci-Est. Comm.*
licet culto divino, quem significat vox λατρεία in plerisque Scripturae locis. in c. 9. Ep.
But this is not absolutely true; for λατρεύω in the Greek of the Septua-
gint answers to the Hebrew Verb שָׁבַד, which denotes to serve, altho' ad Rom.v.9.
it is applied to Divine things, Worship is thereby generally understood,
and the sense thereof must be limited according to the places wherein
it occurs. Now the sequel of the discourse plainly shews, that St. Paul
in this passage speaks concerning his Ministry. In like manner the Syriack Interpreter hath render'd it without any ambiguity *cui ministro.*

Moreover it was requisite to Translate simply, *en mon esprit*, in my mind; as it is express'd in the Greek Original, as also in the Vulgar, and not *par le culte interieur de mon esprit*, by the interior worship of my mind; as the Tran

Grot. Ann.
in c. I. Epist.
ad Rom.

Translators of *Mons* have done, who add in their Note this explanation, which is no less remote from the meaning of St. Paul, *selon le don de l'esprit que j'ay reçu*, according to the gift of the Spirit which I have received. Whereas this expression signifies *with a willing mind, volente animo* (says Grotius) *non renitens*; or as it is said in the Note of the Ministers of Geneva on this passage, *de tout mon cœur & de très-entière affection*, with all my heart and with most entire affection; and in the remark of Dibdet, *Animo sincero & d'affetto interno*, with a sincere mind and an internal affection. I shall not insist on an infinite number of Synonymous words, in which the Version of *Mons* exceedingly abounds, more especially in the Epistles of St. Paul: For either these words express altogether the same thing, and consequently are useless, or they serve for an Explication, and then they ought to be plac'd in the Margent.

In vers. 17. of the same Chapter, where we read in the Vulgar *justitia enim Dei in ea revelatur ex fide in fidem*, which agrees word for word with the Greek Text of St. Paul, these Gentlemen have Translated, *la justice de Dieu nous y est révélée & découverte, c'est à dire la justice qui vient de la foy, & se perfectionne dans la foy. The righteousness of God is therein reveal'd and discover'd to us, that is to say, the righteousness which proceeds from faith, and is perfected in faith.* Is not this rather a Commentary, than a simple Translation? It is true, that they have mark'd in the *Italick* Character, that which they have added to the Text, to form the sense which they judg'd to be most literal; But we ought only to annex to a Version in the *Italick* Letter, such words as are absolutely necessary to avoid the leaving the expressions of the Text indeterminate: Whereas the Translators of *Mons* have frequently inserted them to explain the Text, which cannot be admitted, saving in certain Annotations or in a Commentary, wherein it is lawful to retain the sense as far as it shall be thought expedient. But there is nothing indeterminate or uncertain in this expression of St. Paul, *the righteousness of God is therein reveal'd from faith to faith.* If there be any obscurity in these words, *from faith to faith*, which may be explain'd after different manners, the explication thereof ought to be reserv'd for a Note, and not obtruded in the Text of the Version.

The simple, and even low style of St. Paul, is altogether Elevated and Magnificent in the Translation of *Mons*. Therefore in vers. 37. of the same Chapter, instead of these words, *inventores malorum, inventors of evil things*, which they apparently determin'd to be too simple, they have us'd this phrase in their Translation, *Ils se sont étudiés à inventer de nouveaux moyens de faire le mal, they have studied to invent new methods of doing evil.* They have likewise endeavour'd to elevate this expression of St. Paul, *who makest thy boast in God*, in Chap. 2. vers. 17. of this same Epistle, after this manner, *qui vous glorifiez des faveurs que Dieu vous a faites, who boasteth of the favours which God hath bestow'd on thee.* This other expression of Chap. 5. v. 14. *Death reigned*, being imagin'd to be too mean, they have render'd it more magnificent, by saying, *la mort a*
excess

exercé son règne & sa domination; Death hath exercis'd his reign and do-
minion.

St. Paul, writing to the *Corinthians*, acknowledgeth that his expressions were rude, and without any elegancy; and indeed he generally proceeds directly to his propounded end and by the nearest way; whereas on the contrary he almost always fetches a great compass in the Version of *Port-Royal*. These Gentlemen having read in the Works of St. *Augustin*, that St. Paul was Eloquent, imagin'd that they ought to find in his Epistles the Eloquence that is attributed to them by this Father; Nevertheless, after having almost entirely alter'd the style of this Apostle, they would persuade us to believe that they have endeavour'd with an extreme diligence to avoid all those words that might seem to contain any thing human or exquisite. Care hath been taken (say they) every where to make use of the most simple and most natural expressions. If it were so; they were very much mistaken in using periphrases or Circumlocutions, in an infinite number of places where the words of St. Paul are simple and natural.

Pref. to the
N. T. of
Mons.

That which appears to be yet less exact, is, that they have added in the Text of their Version, by way of illustration, certain terms which limit the meaning thereof, especially if the Grammatical sense be only consider'd. Thus in Chap. 7. vers. 13. of this same Epistle to the *Romans*, where it is written in the Text of St. Paul, *it is sin*, we read in the Version of Mons, *c'est le péché & la concupiscence, it is sin and concupiscence*. After the same manner in Chap. 8. vers. 3. where it is express'd in the *Vulgate*, *infirmitas*, which exactly answers to the Greek Verb *inēves* these Gentlemen have insert'd in their Translation, *la chair la rendant faible & impuissant, the flesh rendring it feeble and impotent*; as if to be feeble were in that place to be impotent and without any strength. This is indeed the sense attributed by *Beza* to the Greek word *inēves*, which he renders by, *viribus esse destituta*; and he assures us in his Note, after a tedious ratiocination, that *ἀδυναμία* doth not signifie in this passage of St. Paul a simple weakness, but an entire failing of strength: *virium non imbecillitatem, sed omnem destitutionem declarat*.

In my opinion the genuine and simple sense of these words of St. Paul, *Propter fornicationem unusquisque suam uxorem habeat, & unaquaque suum virum habeat*, is that which is exhibited in Father *Ameloté's* Version; *Pour éviter toute impudicité, que chaque homme ait sa femme, & que chaque femme ait son mary; To avoid all unchastness, let every Man have his Wife, and let every Woman have her Husband*. We find in the Translation of Mons, *que chaque homme vive avec sa femme, & chaque femme avec son mary, let every Man live with his Wife, and every Woman with her Husband*. Indeed the former sense is included in a Note, as being literal; but since it was so qualified, the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* ought to have plac'd it in the Text of their Interpretation. If they determin'd that it was requisite to restrain these words of St. Paul to persons that were already married, this

Epist. 1. ad
Cor. c. 7. v. 2.

this restriction should be made in the Annotations and not in the body of the Version, in which the express terms of the Original (as much as is possible to be done) ought only to be represented.

According to this method, they ought to Interpret these other words of St. Paul, in *Moyse baptizati sunt*, thus, *were Baptiz'd in Moses*, as they are read in the Version of Geneva conformably to the Original, and not after this manner, *ont esté baptisez sous la conduite de Moyse, were baptiz'd under the conduct or Tuition of Moses*. If they were of Opinion that this was the sense of those words, (which may be explain'd after divers manners) they ought to take notice thereof in a distinct Note.

In the 2. Epistle to the Corinthians, Chap. 3. vers. 13. & 14. where we read in the Vulgar; *Et non sicut Moyses ponebat velamen super faciem suam, ut non intenderent filii Israel in faciem ejus quod evacuatur, sed obtusi sunt sensus eorum*: They have Translated with a long circumstance of words, after their usual method, *Nous ne faisons pas comme Moyse, qui mettoit un voile sur son visage, marquant par là que les enfans d' Israel ne pourroient arrester leur veüe sur celuy qui estoit la fin de la Loy, laquelle devoit cesser, & ainsi leurs esprits sont demeurés endurcis & aveuglés. We do not as Moses, who put a Vail over his Face, signifying thereby, that the Children of Israel could not stedfastly behold that which was the end of the Law, and which ought to cease; and therefore their minds remain'd obdurate and blinded. Can this be call'd a Translation? And is it not rather a Commentary or Paraphrase?*

Bez. Annot.
in Epist. 2.
ad Cor. c. 3.
v. 13.

Besides they have abandon'd the Vulgar to adhere to the ordinary Greek Text. *We have follow'd (say they) the Greek Original which hath in finem, but in the Vulgar it is express'd in faciem; as if there never were extant any other Greek but that of the common Editions. They had apparently read in the Annotations of Beza, whom they imitate in this place, that it was an error of the Transcriber in the Latin Edition. Aulè (says this Calvinist) librorum culpa legitur in Editione Vulgata faciem pro finem. But he is deceiv'd; for we find in the ancient MS. of Alexandria $\omega\epsilon\sigma\omega\pi\omega\nu$ and not $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta$; and it was by a Copy of the like nature that St. Jerom reform'd the ancient Vulgar, in which it was likewise written in finem. It is evident that the Transmutation of the word $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta$ into that of $\omega\epsilon\sigma\omega\pi\omega\nu$ cannot be esteem'd as an error of the Transcriber, since there is no resemblance between those two Greek words.*

Hieron. lib. 1.
Comm. in
Epist. ad
Gal. c. 2.

What reason had the Translators of Mons in Chap. 2. of the Epistle to the Galatians, vers. 11. and 14. to change the name *Cephas*, in the Vulgar, into that of *Peter*, which is contain'd in the ordinary Greek Text? It is true indeed that *Cephas* and *Peter* are the same thing, as St. Jerom hath prov'd in his Commentary on this place, against certain ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, who affirm'd that mention was therein made of another *Cephas* different from St. Peter, *Sunt (says he) qui Cepham cui hic in faciem restituisse se scribit, non putent Apostolum Petrum, sed alium de septuaginta discipulis isto vocabulo nuncupatum. This alone is sufficient to shew that*

Cephas

Cephas was read by many, and indeed, this reading is confirm'd by some ancient *Greek* MSS. and among others by that of *Alexandria*: Therefore it ought not to be intimated, as the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have done in the Margent of their Translation, that it appertains to the Vulgar, since the ancient *Latin* Interpreter hath only inserted in his Version, that which he found in his *Greek* Copy.

Neither can I perceive to what purpose these Translators in Chap. 3. Ver. 22. of the same Epistle, have turn'd the word *Scripture*, which is included in the *Greek* Original, and in all the Versions into that of *writ-ten Law*, unless it were that they have read in *Beza's* Annotations, that *St. Paul* calls that *Scripture* in this place, which he elsewhere stiles *Law* v. 22. *Beza. ibid.* *ἡ γραφή* (says this Minister of *Geneva*) *vocat Apostolus hoc ipsum quod alibi γέγραφα vocavit, id est legem.* But if they intended to imitate *Beza*, they ought not to place that in their Version, which he hath only observ'd in a Note. Indeed, many Divines are of the contrary Opinion, and among others, *Estbuis. Per scripturam* (says he) *quidam legem scriptam, quam alibi literam vocat Apostolus; alii in genere Scripturam Sacram intelligunt: quod in hunc loc. Est Comm. posterius magis probat.*

They had no reason in Chap. 2. Ver. 16. of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, to insert the reading of the ordinary *Greek* Text in their Translation: For whether it be render'd *y ayant détruit; having therein destroy'd* as they have done, or *ayant détruit en soy même; having destroy'd in himself*, as it is express'd in the Vulgar: both Interpretations make a good Sense; besides that *Beza* assures us, that he has read in some *Greek* Copies, *Beza. Annot. conformably to the ancient Latin Version ἐν ἑαυτῷ Vulgata* (says he) *in semetipso, ἐν ἑαυτῷ, quod in nonnullis nostris codicibus Græcis inveni, eodem manente sensu.* Altho *St. Jerom* determin'd in his Commentary, that it was requisite to correct the ancient *Latin* Edition by the *Greek* in this passage; nevertheless, he hath not alter'd it in his correction; therefore the Translators of *Mons* ought to retain the same reading in their Version, being content only to remark that of the Vulgar *Greek* in a distinct Note.

These Gentlemen, who delight very much in circumlocutions, have Translated those words of the same Epistle, *ex quo omnis paternitas in Epist. ad cælis & in terrâ nominatur*, as it is read in the Vulgar, according to the *Ephes. c. 3. Greek* Original, after this manner, *qui est le principe & le chef de toute v. 15. cette grande famille qui est dans le ciel & dans la terre: Who is the Principal and chief head of all this great Family which is in Heaven and Earth.* Then they declare in their Note, after what manner it is literally express'd, as well in the *Greek* Text as in the Vulgar; altho there is no difference between them. The *Latin* word *paternitas* and *πάτερὰ* in the *Greek*, signifies a *Family*, according to the stile of the H. Scripture. If the Translators of *Mons* were exact, they should have observ'd in their Note on this passage, that *St. Jerom* did not read in his *Greek* Copies these words *Hieron. Comm. in* in the preceding Verse, *τὸ κκεῖν ἡμεῖς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, of our Lord Jesus Christ, hunc loc.*

which are contain'd in the present *Greek Text*, and in our *Vulgar*: He believ'd also that they were added afterwards in the *Latin Edition*. And indeed they are not extant in the ancient Copy of *Alexandria*; whereupon the Sense is entirely alter'd; for then *Jesus Christ* would no longer be this principal head, but the Father.

I can apprehend nothing that could oblige them to Translate in Chap. 4. of the same Epistle, Ver. 19 *qui ayant perdu tout remords & tout sentiment; who having lost all remorse and all feeling*: unless they design'd to adhere to the ordinary *Greek Text*. For it ought to be render'd according to the *Vulgar*, which is conformable to the most ancient *Greek MSS.* *ayant perdu esperance*, despairing. It is true, that *St. Jerom* read in his *Greek Copy* ἀπληγνότες, as it is in those that we now have in our possession; But they should consider that they interpreted the *Latin Text*, in which we find the word *desperantes*, and not the *Greek*, and that this reading forms a very good Sense, wherefore it was not expedient to alter it; *St. Jerom* hath likewise retain'd it in his correction, and it is confirm'd by the *Greek Copies* that were us'd by the ancient Interpreter, who read, ἀπληγνότες, as it is written in the MS. of *St. Germain des Prez*, and in that of *Clermont*. Moreover, this Reading is confirm'd by the *Syriack Interpreter*, who was imitated by the Author of the *Arabick Version*.

They have again abandon'd the ancient *Latin Edition*, to adhere unto the Modern Translations; for instead of the *Greek word* ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ, which is express'd in the *Vulgar* by *in Avaritiam*, they have inserted in their Version, *avec un ardeur insatiable; with an insatiable Ardour*, and in their Note, *comme a l'envy, as it were with greediness*. The first Interpretation is maintain'd by *Erasmus*, and the second by *Beza*, together with the other Ministers of *Geneva*. But *Grotius* who hath render'd it in imitation of the ancient Interpreter, *in avaritia*, explains the meaning thereof by this remark, *multi mares ob pretium se prostituiebant*.

Grot. Annot.
in hunc loc.

Would it not have been more natural to Translate in Ver. 20. and 21. of the same Chapter, thus, *Ye have not so learned Christ, if so be that you have heard him*, as it is read in the *Greek Text*, and in the *Vulgar*; than after this manner, *Ce n'est pas ainsi que vous avez esté instruits dans l'Ecole de Jesus Christ, puisque vous y avez entendu prescher; Ye have not been so instructed in the School of Jesus Christ, since he have heard him preach therein?* It were too tedious to produce all the passages wherein they have departed, without sufficient warrant from the Text, which they proposed to be interpreted: Moreover, they very frequently place their explanations, or rather those that they found in the Commentaries in the room of this Text.

Furthermore, was it not more expedient to Translate simply the word *Caro*, in Chap. 2. Ver. 11. of the Epistle to the *Colossians*, by that of *Chair, Flesh*, conformably to the *Greek* and *Latin Text*, than by *Concupiscence charnelle, carnal concupiscence*? The Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* are yet more blame-worthy, on the account that they have prefer'd in the same

same place, the ordinary Greek Text before the Vulgar, without any apparent reason. The ancient Interpreter hath not express'd in his Version, the word τὸν ἀμαρτῶν which he did not read in his Greek Copy; and indeed it is not included in the MS. of St. Germain des Prez, in that of Clermont, nor in some others. Grotius, who perceiv'd it to be wanting in the Alexandrian MS. hath observ'd this diversity of reading. He adds at the same time, that this does not alter the Sense. *In manuscripto brevius sensu eodem, nec aliter legit Latinus.* Beza, on the contrary, hath disallow'd this Reading, which is retain'd in the Latin Edition, altho he acknowledgeth that he found it in one of his MSS. *Vulgata* (says the Calvinist) *non legit τὸν ἀμαρτῶν & interpretatur in exspoliatione corporis carnis, quam lectionem non probo, quamvis in uno vetere codice inventam.* The Translators of Mons, who have taken the decision of Beza for an irrevocable Decree, have declar'd in their Note, that they have follow'd the Greek Original in this Verse.

Grot. Annot.
in c. 2.
Epist. ad
Coross. v. 11.
Bez. Annot.
in eund. loc.

They have likewise (without any necessity) esteem'd the modern Versions beyond the Vulgar, in Chap. 1. Ver. 5. of the 1st Epistle to the Thessalonians, where they have Translated *d'une pleine & entiere persuasion.* We read in the Greek ἐν πανεσφορίᾳ πολλῇ, and in the Latin Edition, in plenitudine multâ. This Translation, if we may give credit to the assertion of Beza, is altogether absurd. *Vulgata* in plenitudine multâ, prorsus ineptè. But Grotius, who again does justice to the ancient Interpreter in this place, hath made this Learned Remark, that these Greek words ἐν πνεύματι ἀγαπᾷ & ἐν πανεσφορίᾳ πολλῇ in Spiritus Sancto & in plenitudine multâ, are the same thing as the ensuing, ἐν πανεσφορίᾳ πολλῇ ὡς πνεύματος ἀγαπᾷ in plenitudine multâ Spiritus Sancti.

Bez. Annot.
in Epist. 1.
ad Thess. c.
1. v. 5.

The passage in Chap. 2. Ver. 13. of the 11th Epistle to the Thessalonians, ought to be render'd thus, *pour estre les premiers, to be the first fruits,* according to the Vulgar, in which we find the word *primitias*, especially since this Translation forms a very good Sense, and is likewise approv'd by the most Learned Interpreters: But the Gentlemen of Port-Royal have Translated conformably to the present Greek Text, *dès le commencement, from the beginning.* This diversity proceeds only from the reading of the word ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in the ordinary Greek; whereas the Latin Interpreter found ἀρχὴν in his Copy, as it is written in some MSS. Altho Grotius read ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in the antient MS. of Alexandria, which he generally follows; nevertheless in his Annotations he prefers the expression of the Vulgar, and affirms that St. Paul in this place speaks concerning the Jews, whom he elsewhere calls the *first fruits of believers.* Beza himself, who often accused the ancient Interpreter without a cause, does not here disapprove his Translation, which he illustrates by another passage of St. Paul; and adds, that this gave occasion to the custom of attributing the name of *Primitive* to the Church, that was planted in those times. *Hinc etiam usus obtinuit, ut illorum temporum Ecclesiam appelleremus primitivam.*

Bez. Annot.
in Epist. 11.
ad Thess. c.
2. v. 13.

In my Opinion it were more judicious to express the reading of the Vulgar word for word, in Chap. 3. vers. 16. of the 1. Epistle to *Timothy*, than to depart from it to adhere to the present *Greek* Text, under colour, that the aforesaid passage, as it is represented in this *Greek*, clearly establishes the mystery of the Incarnation. We do not find the word *God* in this place in the old *Latin* Edition, nor in St. *Jerom's* Correction thereof, and herein it is conformable to the most ancient *Greek* Copies, and to the *Syriack* Version. *F. Amelote* hath Translated according to this reading, *Le mystere de la pieté est grand, qui a esté veu dans la chair, qui a esté justifié dans l'esprit, Great is the mystery of Godliness, which was seen in the flesh, which was justified in the Spirit, &c.*

But we read in the Translation of *Mons.* *Ce mystere de la pieté est grand [Dieu] a paru revêtu de chair. Il a justifié ce qu'il estoit par le St. Esprit, This mystery of Godliness is great, [God] hath appear'd invested with flesh. He hath justified what he was, by the Holy Ghost.* This Interpretation is rather an explication of the passage, than a simple Version. For first, since there is no Pronoun express'd in the *Greek*, but only the Article $\tau\omicron$, it was requisite to Translate, *the mystery*, and not *this mystery*; neither was there any necessity to insert in the Text of the Translation the word *God*, in regard that it is not contain'd in the Vulgar, and it was wanting in the *Greek* Copy of the ancient Interpreter. Moreover, there is a difference, at least as to the Grammatical sense, between these two Expressions, *appear'd invested with Flesh*, and *appear'd in the Flesh*. Lastly it is read as well in the *Greek* Text as in the *Latin* Edition, *was justified in the Spirit*, the word *Holy* not being extant in either of them. Besides I cannot apprehend what reason these Gentlemen had to interpret, *He hath justified what he was, by the Holy Ghost*, and to observe in their Note, that it is literally in the Vulgar, *he was justified by the Holy Ghost*: For as we have been now declar'd, there is no difference thereupon between the *Greek* Copies and the ancient *Latin* Translation.

In Chap. 1. of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, vers. 12. where we find in the Vulgar, *mutabis eos*, and in the Version of *Mons.* *vous les changerez, thou shalt change them.* The Translators of *Port-Royal* have intimated in a Note, that it is read in the Text according to the Letter, *vous les plierez, thou shalt fold them*, as if the former Interpretation were not literal. These Gentlemen apparently intended to exhibit the reading of the ordinary *Greek* Copies, in which the Verb $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ *shalt fold* is actually included. But the ancient Interpreter might have read in his *Greek* Copy $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, *shalt change*, as it is written in some MSS. *Beza* likewise, after *Erasmus*, maintains this reading, because we find in the *Hebrew* Text of the Psalm from whence this passage was taken, the word פָּתַחְתָּם , which signifies *mutabis eos*; as it is written in the ancient *Latin* Edition, call'd *the Italic*: Therefore these Translators ought not to affirm in their Note, that it is literally express'd in this place, *thou shalt fold them*, for this may induce us to believe that the Vulgar is different from the above-cited old Translation, which is not true. These

These words which frequently occur in the Epistle to the Hebrews, *tu es sacerdos in aeternum*, are not very exactly Translated in the Version of Mons, by the ensuing, *vous estes le Prestre eternal, thou art the eternal Priest*. Father Amelote hath render'd them more accurately, *vous estes Prestre pour l'eternité, thou art a Priest for eternity*: It is read according to the same sense in the Version of Geneva, *tu es Sacrificateur eternellement, thou art a Priest eternally, or for ever*; and in the Italian of Diodati, *tu sei Sacerdote in eterno*.

In Chap. 8. of the same Epistle, where the Gentlemen of Port-Royal have Translated, *qui rendent à Dieu un culte qui consiste dans des figures & dans l'ombre des choses du ciel, who render unto God a worship which consists in certain figures, and in the shadow of Heavenly things*, they have not express'd the true sense of this passage, having follow'd the example of Beza, who hath interpreted the Greek Verb λατρεύουσιν by *cultum prastant*, whereas there is not any mention of *Worship* in this place, but of the Ministerial functions of the old Law. Therefore Erasmus hath very well render'd with the ancient Interpreter, *qui exemplari & umbræ deservient celestium*. We read likewise in the Version of Geneva, *lesquelles servent au patron & à l'ombre des choses celestes, which serve unto the pattern and shadow of Heavenly things*; and in the Italian of Diodati, *I quali servono al dimostramento ed all'ombra delle cose celesti, who serve unto the demonstration and shadow*—— Father Amelote who does not usually adhere to the words of his Text hath Translated with more perspicuity and according to the sense, *dont les fonctions consistent en des choses qui sont les figures & les ombres de celles du ciel, whose functions consist in things that are the figures and shadows of the Celestial*.

The same expression is found again in Chap. 13. vers. 10. of this Epistle, where it is read in the Greek *οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες*, and in the Latin *qui tabernaculo deserviunt*. The Gentlemen of Port-Royal have likewise Translated this passage after Beza, *ceux qui rendent encore un culte au Tabernacle, they who celebrate a worship in the Tabernacle*, whereas it ought to be render'd according to F. Amelote's Interpretation, *ceux qui servent dans le Tabernacle, they who serve in the Tabernacle*; or conformably to that of Geneva, *ceux qui servent au Tabernacle*, that is to say, as it is Printed in the Margent of this Version, *who as yet retain the ministry of the Law*. We find also after the same sense in the three Spanish Translations which we have often cited, *los que sirven al Tabernaculo*.

The Translators of Mons have abandon'd the ancient Latin Edition without any necessity in Chap. 9. vers. 28. of this Epistle, where they have Translated the Greek word ἀνεύσχειν by *porter sur soy, to bear on himself*, observing at the same time that it is express'd in the Vulgar to *deface*, that is to say, to take away: Indeed this is the sense that ought to be ascrib'd in this Version to the Latin Verb *exhaurire*, which very well answers to the Greek ἀνεύσχειν, altho' Beza, who departs as far as is possible from the ancient Interpreter, hath rejected this Translation, and
hath

low before the staff of Command, which was carried by his Son, marking in the Italick Letter those last words of Command, that was carried by his Son, which are not comprehended in the Greek Original, nor in any Version.

This is the usual Custom of these Gentlemen, who frequently thrust into their Translation that which they have read in Commentaries. It was requisite to Translate according to the Vulgar, *il adora le bout de son baston*, he ador'd the top of his Staff; or rather with relation to the Greek Text, as it is Printed in the Version of Geneva, *il adora sur le bout de son baston*, he worshipped on the top of his Staff. If they intended to supply any word in the Translation to render the sense more clear, there was no necessity to have recourse unto this pretended staff of Command, but they ought to add the word God after that of ador'd, and to render the sense thus, *il adora Dieu s'appuyant sur le bout de son baston*, he Worshipped God leaning on the top of his Staff. Indeed we find in the Greek ἐν τῷ ἄκρῳ, on the top; and the word *Dominum* hath been added in our Vulgar in Genesis, Chap. 47. v. 31. from whence this passage is taken. These Gentlemen have plainly inserted in their Version, the Explication which is chiefly approv'd by *Esthins* in his Commentary.

Many other remarks might be made on the Translation of *Mons*; but besides that, those that have been above produc'd are sufficient to prove that it is not exact; It was not my design to give a particular account of all its Errors, which would be too tedious: And I fear that I have already insisted too long on a subject which perhaps doth not deserve so great application. However, if the Translators of *Port-Royal* shall think fit to take my advice, they will be easily induc'd to cast their Version into a new modell, even from the beginning to the end thereof. Let us now proceed to those of other Nations in the Vulgar Tongue.

C H A P. XL.

Of the Italian Versions, and first of that of Jacobus de Voragine Arch-Bishop of Genoua. Of the Translation of Nicholas Malermi or Malherbi, and of some others in the same Language.

Jacobus de Voragine about four hundred years ago, Translated the whole Bible into *Italian* from the Vulgar, but in regard that it was never Printed, neither have I found so much as one Manuscript Copy thereof in any Library, it cannot be expected that I should give a particular account of this Version; Nevertheless, we may conjecture that the afore-said Bishop only publish'd an *Italian* Translation of that of *Comestor*, which was then very much esteem'd and read, rather than the Text of the Bible.

That

Nicol.
Maler.

Maler.
Epist. ad
Laurert.
Franciscan.
c. 6.

That which confirms this conjecture, is, that the Abbot *de Malermi*, hereafter mention'd, acknowledgeth in an Epistle prefix'd before the former Editions of his Version, that he was was not the first who had Translated the Bible into *Italian*, and adds, that the Translations which were set forth before him, are defective in many places, and that some things have been inserted therein, which do not belong to the Text of the H. Scriptures. *Dico adunque* (says this Translator) *che quelli già stati vulgarizzati libri over mancano de testo & cui etiam ajuncio com queste cose che nel vero & original & literal volume non si contiene.* In my opinion, this can be applied to nothing else, but the Work of *Peter Comestor*. However, *Malermi* declares, that the Author of this *Italian* Version, who preceded him, was unknown, and attributes thereto the Title of an *Apocriphal Translation*. *Apocrifa essa translatione, non ponendo si in quella l'autore di essa translatione.*

Upon the whole matter, that which oblig'd the Abbot *Malermi* to publish another Translation of the Bible in the language of his Native Country, is, that which was then extant, was mutilated in some places, and full of additions in others, and would require more timeto correct the errors thereof, than is necessary for the making of a new Version. He adds moreover, that there were some things in this ancient *Italian* Translation, that ought not to be inserted therein, and which it was not lawful to read. *Certe enorme cosa e che scrivano cose che non lice ser dicte ne da essere leginte.*

Book 2.
ch. 22.

These reasons that we have even now rehears'd, induc'd *Nicholas Malermi* or *Malherbi*, to set forth an entire Version of the Text of the Bible, which he compos'd from the ancient *Latin* Edition, according to the custom of that time. I have observ'd in the critical History of the Old Testament, that he gives no account of his New Translation in the *Vulgar Tongue*; because I had then only in my Head the Edition of 1541. from which the above-cited Epistle was retrench'd; He dedicates this Epistle to a certain *Franciscan* Monk nam'd *Laurentius*, who was a Professor of Divinity *Epistola de Don Nicolo Malherbi Veneto ac Reverendissimo Professore dela Sacra Theologia Maestro Laurentio de l'Ordine di San Francisco nella Biblia vulgarizzato.*

Moreover, (a) he therein informs us, that his intention was to be serviceable to those who have not applied themselves unto Learning in their youth; and adds, that the Holy Scriptures instruct the Learned in true Wisdom, and the ignorant in true Religion: He likewise prefers this Study before that of all other Sciences. The Art of Speaking well

(a) Io desirando de soccorrere a li non dediti a le lectione de la Divina Scriptura per non haverse dati da tenera eta a la doctrina, per el cui studio de essa Divina Scriptura li docti se redrizano a la vera sapientia. & li non docti la vera Religione. La qual professione molto e da essere reputata meglior & piu utile & piu gloriosa che l'altre doctrine. *Maler. Epist. ad Laur. Franciscan. c. 1.*

(says

(says he) is peculiar to very few persons, but that of living well, which is taught in the H. Scriptures, appertains to all Men ; *El ben dicere sa-* *Ibid. c. 2.*
partiene a pochi: ma conviense el ben vivere a tutti.

As for his method, he declares that he hath exactly follow'd the *Latin* Version of St. *Jerom*, to whom he attributes the name of the most Holy and most Illustrious Interpreter, the Light of the Church, and Father of the faithful Catholicks. *De noi e instituito el vulgarizare dela Sacra Scriptura de lantiquo & novo Testamento contenuto in tutto el volume de la Biblia tradutta de Hebraeo de Hebraeo & Græco in lingua nostra Latina per el sanctissimo & clarissimo vero interprete lume dela Chiesa padre deli fideli Catholici sancto Hieronymo.* He assures us at the same time (*b*) that he hath adher'd to the Letter of his Text, without any addition or diminution, but if he was oblig'd to enlarge a little in some places, he hath done it only for the satisfaction and consolation of his Readers, as in the Book of *Psalms*, where he hath added somewhat to the ordinary Titles thereof, to render them more intelligible.

Furthermore, in regard that this Monk distrusted his own ability and fear'd lest he should not well apprehend the Sense of some places that were difficult to be render'd ; he intreats Dr. *Laurentius* (who was a Professor of Theology) in his Epistle, to revise and correct his Translation *Onde noi (says he) habiando assumpta una tanta & tal provincia non si* *Ibid. c. 3.*
confidendo dela nostra sufficiente intelligentia habiamo se accostato a te clarissimo doctore accioche veduta la nostra traduzione & examinata in quella parte dove per inadvertentia over per variatione de libri essere mancata corrigendo supplisse volendo con altrui arme maggiormente certare che nudo presumptuosamente vivere in esso.

But whatsoever pains he may have taken (as he affirms) in Translating faithfully, and according to the Letter, even to the utmost of his power, the whole Volumes of the Sacred Scriptures, into the *Italian* Tongue ; it doth not appear that he hath had good success in this undertaking. He seems to have done nothing else but corrected the preceding Version ; nevertheless, he would persuade us that the world was oblig'd to him for laying aside all his other affairs *postponendo altre mie fa-* *Ibid. c. 7.*
cende, to apply himself solely to this work, in accomplishing whereof he had spent above eight Months, *assumendo la fatica di circa mesi otto.*

(*b*) *Habiamo con el nostro piccolo ingegno secondo che se contiene quanto a la propria lettera de parola a parola tradutto tutto el testo dela Biblia — non variando ne minuendo ne in alcuna parte accresciendo che si sparti dal vero intelletto & sincero sentimento da essa semplice & pura lettera. Et se pur in qualche loco gli e stato ampliato per necessita habbiamo lo facto constreto per el satisfamento & maggior consolatione di legenti, & questo maximamente circa el Psalterio nel qual preponesse li tituli a ogni Psalmo, Maler. *ibid. c. 5.**

If we may give credit to his asseverations (c) he hath omitted nothing that might in any wise tend to express the Sense of his Text literally, and without any *periphrasis* or circumlocution, at least, as far as the propriety of these two Languages would permit, it being extremely difficult (according to his Opinion) to Translate *Latin* into *Italian*, without adding certain small supplements in the Version, by reason that the expressions of the former are much more concise than those of the later. He subscribes at the bottom of this Epistle, which serves as a Preface to his Work, *By me Nicholas de Malherbi a Venetian Monk of St. Bennet, of the Order of Camandola. Per me Nicolo di Malberbi Veneto, Monacho de Sancto Benedecto de l'Ordine di Camandole.*

We find after this Epistle, an Answer written in *Latin* by Dr. *Laurentius*, a Franciscan Frier, to the Abbot *de Malherbi*, it is entituled, *Ad Reverendissimum in Christo Patrem & Dominum Donum N. de Malberbis Venetum, Ordinis gloriosi Benedicti Monasterii S. Michaelis de Lemo Abbatem dignissimum majorem colendum Laurentius Venetus Theologorum minimus ex Ordine Cordiferum.* This Cordelier Monk readily gives his approbation to the Abbot's *Italian Bible*, which (d) he commends, principally on the account of the elegance of its expressions; but a Version of the *H. Scripture* in the purity of the *Italian Tongue*, ought not to be expected from *Venice*, especially at a time, when very few of that Nation were addicted to the refining of their Language. Moreover, it is written in a very rude Stile, and with little exactness.

The New Testament of this Translation begins after the same manner as the *French Version* of the Gospels, which is contain'd in one of the above-cited MSS. of the King's Library; for as it is express'd in the *French*, *Ce livre de la generation Jesu Christ; This is the Book of the generation of Jesus Christ*: So likewise we read in the *Italian*, *Questo e libro dela generatione de Jesu Christo figliuolo de David, &c.* The Translator hath also inserted in *Italian*, all the Prefaces that are comprehended in the most part of the *Latin MSS.* of St. *Jerom's Bible*, and among others, that which bears the name of this Father, being prefix'd to the seven Canonical Epistles. He hath describ'd the Title thereof in these terms, *Here beginneth the Epistle of St. Jerom to Eustochius, which serves as a Prologue to the seven Canonical Epistles. Qui vi comincia la Epistola di sancto Hieronimo ad Eustochio portata per prologo a le sette Epistole Canoniche.*

(c) *Habiamo sforzato col piccolo ingegno & intellecto di con meno circulatione ne stato possibile satisfar, se non in tutto al meno in qualche parte a luno & laltro intellecto non pero partendosi dal vero sentimento dela litera, ma de parola a parola habiamo vulgarizato. Id. Maler. ibid. c.7.*

(d) *Licet vulgari quadam locutione maternoque eloquio usus fueris, eloquenti nihilominus stilo facundoque sermone ipsam sacrorum doctrinam, quam Græci Agiographiam vocant, summo opere decorasti. Laur. Epist. ad Nicol. de Malherb.*

Moreover,

Moreover he hath digested the Books of the New Testament in the same order, as they were written at that time in many *Latin* Copies, viz. the Epistles of St. Paul, and the three Canonical follow immediately after the Gospels, and the *Acts* of the Apostles, together with the *Revelation* compose the third part : He hath likewise annex'd in *Italian* at the end of the Old Testament the History of the *Septuagint*, as it is now extant under the name of *Aristaus*. *El libro d'Aristea de Septanta due Interpreti a Philocrate suo fratello.*

The several Editions of this Translation that were publish'd within a very little while, are evident proofs, that the Bible was then read by the *Italians* in their own Language. I have also seen two different Editions of the year 1477. one of which was set forth by a *Dominican* Fryar, who profess'd to expound the Holy Scriptures at *Venice*, and hath added certain Summaries thereto, as appears from these words, which are found at the end of this Edition. *Finita e la Biblia vulgare a laude del Omnipotente & dela sua madre Virgine Maria & a consolatione de le genti rubricata per me Fraire Marino de Venetia del Ordine de Predicatori dela sacra pagina humile Professore seguendo la expositione de Nicolo de Lyra & de li altri doctori dechiarando summarie quelle che contengono li capituli quanto la breuita de le rubriche patiscono. In Venetia impressa da Maestro Antonio Bolognese regnante Sixto Quarto Pontifice Maximo, ac Andrea Vendramino inclito Principe imperante nel 1477. Here endeth the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue, to the praise of the Almighty, and of his Mother the Virgin Mary, and to the consolation of the people, dtoided into Rubricks by me F. Marino of Venice of the Order of the Preaching Fryars, an humble Professor of the Sacred Writings, having follow'd the Exposition of Nicholas de Lyra, and other Doctors, and having describ'd the Summaries that are contain'd in the several Chapters ; as far as the breuity of the Rubricks will admit. Printed at Venice by Master Antonio of Bononia under the Popedom of Sixtus IV. and the Reign of the illustrious Prince Andrea Vendramino in the Year 1477. In the time of the same Pope Sixtus IV. the Epistles and Gospels which are recited in the Mass during the whole year, were Printed and deliver'd into the hands of the people, as hath been elsewhere observ'd.*

Marinus
Dorin Fryar
of Venice.

Another *Italian* Translation of the New Testament taken from the *Latin* Edition was Printed at *Venice*, *Ann. Dom.* 1542. Father Zachary a *Dominican* Fryar of *Florence*, who is the Author thereof, hath not inserted any Preface at the beginning of his work ; but only an exact Table of the Epistles and Gospels that are read in the Mass throughout the whole Year. *Tavola con la quale si posson trovare l'Epistole & gli Evangelii che per tutto l'anno si dicono nelle messe.* To this Table he hath subjoyn'd an Advertisement, wherein he sufficiently declares that he had no other design in publishing his Version in the *Thuscan* language, in *lingua Toscana*, than to exhibit to the people the Books of the New Testament in their Mother-Tongue, to the end that they might understand that which is repeated in *Latin* in the Offices of the Mass. *Con l'ajute* (says he)

Chap. 2.

Era. Zach. *della presente Tavola lettore humanissimo si trovano tutte l'Epistole & tutti li da Firen. al Evangelii che si leggono nelle messe ne giorni Domenicali, Quadragesimali, lettore de sia festivi & feriali.*
 Tabula.

Before the appearing of the Protestants, no care was taken to set forth any other Versions of the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue, than those that were compos'd from the ancient *Latin* Edition. And indeed altho' there were very few persons at that time who were capable of interpreting the Holy Scriptures from the Originals, yet even common sense requir'd that such Translations should be deliver'd into the hands of the People as were conformable to that which was read in the Church. *Antonio Brucioli* is the first who hath imitated the Protestants in this method; for he Translated the whole Bible into *Italian* from the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Text, or rather from the *Latin* Version of *Pagninus*, which was extracted from these Originals.

The very Title of this Version as it is Printed in the Edition of *Venice* in 1539. shews that this Interpreter was not well vers'd in the reading of the Bible; For he speaks of the Chapters of *Daniel* and *Esther*, which are not included in the *Hebrew* Text, but only in the *Greek*, as if they were new, and had been found out in these later times. I shall here subjoin the Title it self, viz. *La Biblia quale contiene i sacri Libri del Vecchio Testamento tradotti dalla Hebraica verita in lingua Toscana per Antonio Brucioli aggiuntivi duoi Libri di Esdras & piu Capitoli in Daniel & in Esther nuovamente trovati, & il terzo Libro de Machabei con divini Libri del Nuovo Testamento di Christo Jesu Signore & Salvatore nostro tradotti dal Greco per medesimo; The Bible in which are contain'd the sacred Books of the Old Testament. Translated from the true Hebrew Original into the Tuscan or Italian Tongue, by Antonio Brucioli, whereto are added two Books of Esdras and some other Chapters in those of Daniel and Esther lately found, as also the third Book of the Maccabees, together with the Divine Writings of the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Translated likewise from the Greek by the same Author.* He unadvisedly confounds the Chapters of *Daniel* and *Esther*, which are only compris'd in the *Greek* Text, from whence they were render'd into *Latin*, with the two last Books of *Esdras* and the third of the *Maccabees*: Now the Church hath admitted into her Canon these Chapters of *Daniel* and *Esther*, excluding those other Books.

At the beginning of this Edition is inserted a large Epistle Dedicated to *Francis I.* King of *France*. *Al Christianissimo Re Francesco Primo Re di Francia*, wherein after having discoursed at large concerning the *Messiah*, he adds that it is esteem'd as a reproach to a Philosopher not to know the principles of his Sect, whilst we Christians do not consider the ill consequence of not understanding the Fundamental Doctrines of the Gospel.

He likewise prefixeth before his Version of the New Testament another

ther Epistle inscrib'd to the same Prince, (e) which is full of Invectives against those who condemn the Translations of the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue: He treats them as Hypocrites and as people that are endued rather with the spirit of the Devil than with that of God, and who in this oppose Christian Charity: He accounts those persons as impious, who presume to contradict that which the Holy Ghost hath declar'd by the mouth of the Prophets and Apostles. If they had diligently perus'd (continues he) the Books of *Moses*, they would not persist in being so contrary to Christian Charity.

It is probable that the mind of this Man was full of that which he had read in the Writings of the Protestants, whose style he exactly imitates. But it has been above shewn by many examples, that the Versions of the Holy Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue were not disallow'd in *Italy*, nor even in any other part of the World before the appearing of the Protestants; Nevertheless, when it was perceiv'd that those Versions gave occasion to great disorders both in Church and State, there was a sufficient reason to stop the course of them, at least for some time.

Brucchioli hath discours'd of these prohibitions with too much vehemency, and this might induce us to believe that he was not very far from the opinion of the Protestants. However, I have nothing to add here to the judgment that has been already given concerning this Translation in the Critical History of the Old Testament, wherein we have described the several Editions thereof: It is subject to the defect which is common to the most part of those persons who have undertaken to Translate the Holy Scripture into the Language of their native Country; very few of them have attain'd to a sufficient knowledge of the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Text, altho' they all avouch in the beginning of their Works, that they have compos'd their Versions from these Originals; and it is on this account that they do not retain a constant Uniformity therein, sometimes following our Interpreter, and sometimes another.

This hath frequently happen'd to *Brucchioli*, who was not capable of judging of the best Translations. He hath render'd for example in Chap. 6. of *St. Matthew*, vers. 11. according to the reading of the Vulgar, *pane soprasustanziale*; whereas he ought to Translate with the most judicious Interpreters, *pane cotidiano*; And I am apt to believe that this is the sense that ought here to be attributed to the word *suprasubstantialem*, and

(e) Qui bavebbe havuto fine la epistola nostra la quale sono costretto tirar la più in lungo per rispondere a quegli che con un sottile spirito hipocrito mosso da Satan malignando contro a la christiana charita dicono non esser b-n fatto che essa sacra & divina Scrittura fusse in altra lingua che ne le literali naturalmente da nessuno popolo parlate. Et questa impia parola dico non tanto esser priva dela charita christiana; ma ancora contro a quell che ne dice lo Spirito sancto per la bocca de suoi Propheti & Aposto'i — ma se bene havessino letto questi tali Mose & visto lo intendimento de le sue parole, non maj se non con diabolica malignita tanto sarien contrarii a la charita christiana. Brucc. Epist. ad Reg. Franc. I.

which St. *Jerom* hath inserted in the ancient *Latin* Edition when it was revis'd by him, it being before written therein *quotidianum*; for this learned Father undoubtedly determin'd that the word *super substantialis*, express'd more Grammatically that of *ἐπισημῶν* in the *Greek* Text.

We shall apply to the *Italian* Version of the New Testament of *Giovanni Diodati* Minister of *Geneva*, that which has been elsewhere declar'd concerning his Translation of the Old Testament in the aforesaid Language, since he exactly observes the same method in both. The design of this Translator being to render the Holy Scriptures as intelligible as is possible to be done, hath added certain small supplements which form a more clear and perfect sense. It is true, that it is almost impossible to Translate *Greek* or even *Latin* into *Italian*, without this sort of additions; but this ought to be perform'd with great precaution, lest we should happen to limit the sense of the Text according to our own particular *Idea's*. He hath sometimes specified general expressions, and under pretence of taking away the ambiguity of some words, he hath prevented the discovery of other significations which might be attributed to them.

I should have nothing to object against this method, if he had supplied this defect in his Notes: it were easie for him to remark, that the words of the Original which he Translated might admit another sense. But there are on the contrary some places, where he adds in his Notes certain restrictions that confirm what he hath inserted in his Translation, as if there were no other Interpretation but that which is produc'd by him; Moreover he sometimes weakens in a Note the literal sense of his Version.

He hath for instance, in Chap. i. of the Epistle to the *Romans*, vers. 4. render'd these *Greek* words *ὅς ἐπεδείκνυτο ἐν δυνάμει*, thus, *diffinito potentemente, powerfully defined*; indeed the word *ἐπεδείκνυτο* cannot be more literally Translated than by *diffinito, defined*: but when he adds in the Margent, that is to say, *dichiarato, declar'd*, he introduceth another sense. He hath faithfully Interpreted those *Greek* words in the same Verse *πνεῦμα ἀγίων* after this manner, *secondo lo spirito della santità*. But the Note annex'd in the Margent, which he has taken from the Annotations of *Beza*, whom he generally follows, does not seem to be altogether literal; *That is to say, (says he) his divine nature, la sua natura divina*.

It were needless to insist any longer on the *Italian* Version of *Diodati*, which, notwithstanding the above cited defects, does not cease to be endued with very good qualifications: And if we except certain restrictions which sometimes proceed from the prejudicate Notions of his Theology, it is one of the most accurate Translations of the New Testament that hath been compos'd in these later times. But forasmuch as this Translator intended only to instruct those of his own party, he hath accommodated his Interpretation and Notes to their Doctrine; and it was absolutely necessary, according to the Principles of the Divines of

Geneva, that they should find their Confession of Faith in the Holy Scripture, wherefore he was oblig'd to limit in some places conformably to this *Idea*, that which was express'd in too general terms in the Original.

The first Edition of *Diodati's Italian Bible* was printed at *Geneva*, Anno Dom. 1607. in a large Volume in 4^{to}. with this Title, *La Biblia cioe i Libri del Vecchio & del Nuovo Testamento nuovamente traslati in lingua Italiana da Giovanni Diodati di nation Lucchese*: The Bible, that is to say, the Books of the Old and New Testament, newly Translated into the Italian Tongue, by Gio. Diodati of Lucha. He publish'd another Edition thereof in the Year 1641. which is more common; but I have every where made use of the first throughout this Work. Besides this, he is the Author of a Version of the whole body of the Holy Scriptures in bad *French*, as hath been elsewhere observ'd: Moreover, there are several Editions of his New Testament printed separately. The *French* Edition is mentioned by F. Veron, who prefers it before that of *Geneva* in a little Treatise, Entituled, *Les falsifications des Bibles de Geneve reconnues & corrigees en la Bible de Diodati*: The falsifications of the Geneva Bibles discover'd and corrected by that of Diodati. Indeed there are some places wherein he is more exact; but *Veron* hath insisted almost only on certain minute circumstances.

Altho' *Diodati* hath inserted in the Margent of the Bible, especially in the New Testament, a very great number of remarks, yet he seems to have avoided of set-purpose those that have respect to the Critical Art: We do not find therein as in the *Latin* Edition of *Beza*, whom nevertheless he often imitates, the various readings of the *Greek* Text. Forasmuch as the Author of this Version wrote in the *Vulgar Tongue* he apparently fear'd lest this sort of Observations should produce an ill effect in the mind of those of his own party, especially among the ignorant people, who are persuaded, that the Providence of God has not suffer'd any alteration to be admitted into the Sacred Writings.

C H A P. XLI.

Of the Spanish Versions, and first of a MS. Bible in the Catalonian Language, which is kept in the King's Library. Of the several Editions of the New Testament in the Spanish Tongue.

THE *Jews* of *Ferrara* make mention in the Preface to their Spanish Bible of a Version of the Holy Scriptures in the *Catalonian Language*, which they affirm to have been printed *Por que* (say they) *Italia, Francia, Flandes, Alemana, y Inglaterra no carescan della* (Biblia) *y aun en Catalunn en nostra Espanna se traslado y imprimio en la misma lengua Catalana.* Preface to the Spanish Bible of Ferrara.

italians; For Italy, France, Flanders, Germany and England, do not want Editions of the Bible, and there is one extant in Catalonia, a Province of our Country of Spain, which is Translated and Printed in the same Catalonian Language. I have not seen this Printed Catalonian Bible; but we find in the King's Library, a MS. Translation of all the H. Scriptures, taken from the Vulgar, which appear'd to me to be written in the Catalonian or old Provincial Tongue.

In regard that this Bible is extremely scarce, it were worth the while here to produce some extracts thereof. The Book of Genesis begins thus; *Excod. MS. 6831. En lo principi crea Deu lo cel e la terra. E la terra hera vana & vnyda & les tenebres heran sobra la fac del abis e lespit de Deu era portat sobre les aygues. Et dix Deu sia feta. la lum & la lumfu feta. le viu Deu que le lum seria bona & depertile lum de les tenebres he appella le lum dia & les tenebres nit.* We read at the end of the Book of Deuteronomy, *aci son acabats los 5 libres de Moyses. Et comensa lo prolech de sent Jeronim sobre lo libre de Jehs nave*: Inasmuch that they have Translated in this Version, the ordinary Prefaces of St. Jerom, which were extant in the Latin Bibles.

This Catalonian Bible is very fairly written on fine Parchment, and bound in three Volumes. The Second whereof begins thus, with the Proverbs of Solomon. *Cod. MS. 6832. Les paraules de Salamo fill de David Rey de Isrl a saber saviesa & diciplin.* And after this, with the same connexion, Ecclesiastes, Cants, Prophetes, Maccabees.

The Third Volume contains the New Testament. There is no Preface before the Gospels, which begin thus; *Cod. MS. n. 6833. Libra dela generacion de Jeshu Xest fill de David fill de Abraam. Abraam engendra Ysach. Ysach engendra Jacob. Jacob engendra Judes & sos freres.* The Epistles of St. Paul follow immediately after the four Gospels, after this manner: *Paul serps de Jeshu Xest appellat Apostol de piit en la vangeli de Deu.* They are dispos'd in the same order as in our Vulgar, and we read at the end of the Epistle to the Hebrews in a red Letter, *esplegadas son tots les eples de sent Paul. e comensa lo plech sobre libre de les fets dels Apostolos lo ql scriith sent Luch Evangelists.*

After the Prologue of St. Jerom, the Acts of the Apostles begin thus, *o Teofil yo he pmeramente plat de totes les coses que Jehs comensa affer.* At the end of the Acts is written in a red Character, *esplegat eslo libre del fet dels Apostols lo qual scriith sent Luch. Comensa lo prolech sobre lor de deles epistoles canonicals.* This Prologue prefix'd to the seven Canonical Epistles, is the ordinary Preface attributed to St. Jerom. Lastly, the Apocalypse ensues after these Epistles.

Furthermore, we may have recourse on this occasion, to that which has been already observ'd concerning the other Versions of the Bible in the Spanish Tongue. The greater part of these Translations, which were written in different Dialects, are not any longer extant, the rigor of the Inquisition which is predominant in those Countries, having abolish'd them; and those that remain at present, were compos'd by certain Spaniards, who

who had embrac'd the Protestant Religion, *Franciscus Enzinus* publish'd in the last age, an entire Version of the New Testament in *Spanish*, Dedicated by him to the Emperor *Charles V.* which was then much talk'd of in the *Low-Countries*; but I have not this Translation in my possession; at least, I have none that bears this name; neither could I find it in the best Libraries of *Paris*, where there are very few *Spanish* Bibles. The Learned Mr. *Bigot* of *Rouen* lent me the Three Editions of the New Testament, which I have oftentimes cited in this Work.

There was Printed at *Venice*, *Anno Dom. 1556.* a Version of the New Testament in the *Castillian* Language, which was taken from the *Greek*, as appears from this Title prefix'd thereto: *El Testamento Nuevo de nuestro Senior Salvador Jesu Christo nueva y fielmente traduzido del original Griego en Romance Castellano. En Venecia en casa de Juan Philadelpho. The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, truly and faithfully Translated from the Greek Original into the Castillian Tongue. Printed at Venice in the House of Giovanni Philadelpho.* The Translator conceals his name, and only discovers in a preliminary Epistle, which he Dedicates to *JESUS CHRIST*, the Almighty King of Heaven and Earth, *Al todo poderoso Rey de cielos y tierra Jesu Christo*, that he was a *Spaniard*.

Besides this, he hath inserted another large Epistle at the beginning of his Translation, in which he explains what is meant by the New Testament, and produces the reasons that oblig'd him to Translate it into the *Vulgar Tongue*. He earnestly endeavors, to the utmost of his power, to establish the use of these kinds of Versions, even by the example (a) of the Apostles themselves, who (as he says) to the end that they might divulge the Gospel of *Jesu Christ* to a greater number of People; wrote not in the *Hebrew* Dialect, whereof very few persons had any knowledge; nor in *Syriack*, nor in *Latin*, as not being Languages of a very large extent, but in *Greek*, which was the most universal throughout the whole *Roman Empire*.

He absolutely condemns the reading of the Gospel in an unknown Tongue, because it seems to him to be altogether unprofitable. *Que provecho* (says he) *puede ninguno sacar dello que no sabe ni entiende?* He declares, that this is the principal motive that incited him to interpret the

(a) Los sanctos Apostoles entendida la intencion y voluntad de su maestro para cumplir bien su ministerio y divulgar mas amplamente lo que les avia encargado no escribieron en lengua Hebrayca por ser entonces familiar a pocas personas, y essas doctas en las sanctas Escrituras, ni tan poco en lengua Siriaca o en Latin por la mesma razon. Pero casitos los escribieron el Evangelio en lengua Griega, por que era entonces usada, y entendida no solamente en Grecia sino tambien entre los Hebreos y los Romanos, y generalmente entre todos los que habitavan en Asia y en Europa que entonces estavan sujetos al Imperio Romano. Pref. du N. T. Espagu. imp. en. 1556.

New Testament in his Native Language, to which he adds another (b) viz. that it was also to promote the Story of his Nation, who having acquir'd a very great reputation by their Valour and Conquests, ought likewise to have the honour of being the most refin'd of all others, with respect to matters of Religion. It is easie to judge that this *Spanish* Interpreter intended only in publishing his Version of the New Testament, to introduce into his Country the Innovations of the Protestants; not but that we allow with him the just commendations that are due to these Divine Books, but he seems to recommend the reading thereof with so much eagerness, only to condemn the practice of the greater part of the Christian Churches who read them in a Language that is not understood by the people.

In his Translation he observes a mean between those that are too literal, and those that are too licentious, and adheres to his Text; nevertheless, without being obscure, for he adds, that which is necessary to be supplied to render it intelligible, and to avoid leaving the Sense uncertain; but he does not always mark these additions in the *Italick* Character; and since he maintains no uniformity therein, I am apt to believe that he hath rather Translated from the Versions that were compos'd from the *Greek* Text before him, than from the Original. He hath included between two Crochets, certain words which are not extant in the *Greek*, to the end that there might be nothing obscure in his Translation, or, as he explains it, *por guardar la propiedad del Romance, y que se entienda mejor lo que se lee; To retain the propriety of the Language, and for the better understanding of that which is read.*

Moreover, he hath annex'd in the Margent of his Text certain short Notes, some whereof illustrate that which is not sufficiently clear, and others describe the several significations of one and the same word in the *Greek*; but besides the rarity of these observations, they are not always exact; Lastly, this Translator hath follow'd, without any distinction whatsoever he hath read in other Versions of the New Testament.

I have elsewhere cited some passages of a Version of the whole Bible in the *Spanish* Tongue, Publish'd by *Cassiodorus Reyna*, which was afterward Reprinted by *Cyprianus de Valera*, with very few alterations: Forasmuch as this former Edition is scarce, and in regard that I have made but little mention thereof in the Critical History of the Old Testament, I shall here supply that defect. If we may judge of this *Spanish* Translation by a large Preface, which is inserted at the beginning, the Author seems to have omitted nothing that might tend to the rendring of his Work compleat and exact. But he was not capable of acting conformably to all those that are prescrib'd by him on this occasion.

(b) *La obra de dos causas que arriba dixe que me movieron a este trabajo fue por servir a la gloria de mi nacion, la quale afamada por todas partes de animosa y de victoriosa. Y ella tambien que se gloria d'esta cosa mas limpia y la mas pura de todas las otras naciones quanto a los errores que se han levantado por el mundo contra la Religion Christiana. Ibid.*

Altho' he professeth to have a great deal of respect for the ancient *Latin* Edition on the account of its antiquity; Nevertheless he declares that he could not follow it, by reason that it differ'd in many places from the Original, whereto he was oblig'd to adhere: his design being (as far as was possible) to exhibit the pure word of God, *pretendiendo dar la pura palabra de Dios en quanto se puede hazer.* He imagines that he hath conform'd himself to the Decrees of the ancient Councils, and to the precepts of the Doctors of the Church, who require (according to his Opinion) that all Translations should be regulated by the Originals, since there is no Version that he esteem'd of sufficient authority to supply their room; Nevertheless, he adds, that he hath not forborn to consult the Vulgar and all other Translations that he could find: *la consultamos como a qual quiera de los otros exemplares que tuvimos.*

*Cassiod. Reyn.
Pref. to his
Span. Vers.*

But it doth not appear that he hath perus'd any other Original of the Old Testament than the Version of *Pagninus*, which he generally follows (as he himself declares) because he determin'd it to be the most exact of all others: *siguiendo comunemente la translation de Santos Pagnino que al voto de todos los doctos en la lingua Hebraica es tenida por la mas pura que hasta aora ay.* However, he would persuade us to believe, that when there arose any difficulty, he hath not adher'd to *Pagninus* nor to any other Translator, but that he hath had recourse to the *Hebrew* Text, and after having examin'd the different Interpretations, hath made choice of those that seem'd to him to be the most genuin.

Moreover, he affirms, that for the satisfaction of all people, especially in the most important places, he hath inserted the different explanations in the Margent, to the end that every one might chuse that which he should think fit; if perhaps those that are contain'd in the Text of his Translation, were not approv'd. He acknowledges likewise, that he hath made use of the *Spanish* Version of the *Jews* in this affair to very good purpose, especially in that which relates to the Primitive and natural signification of the *Hebrew* words and the Tenses of Verbs: And indeed in regard that the *Hebrew* Text is therein express'd word for word, *palabra por palabra*, it might serve him instead of a Grammar and a Dictionary; Nevertheless he was oblig'd to abandon it in divers places, for certain reasons that are alledg'd by him in his Preface; besides, that being too literal, it is frequently intricate and obscure.

Altho' *Cassiodorus Reyna* hath applied himself to the composing of a Version that might be generally understood; yet he avouches at the same time, that he hath neither added nor diminished any thing in the Original, unless it be perhaps a particular word, article, or repetition of a Verb, without obstructing the sense thereby: besides, he hath not done it but in those places where it was impossible to avoid this alteration, with respect to the Idiom of the *Spanish* Tongue: He assures us likewise that he hath taken so great care in this matter, that no other Version of the Bible hitherto extant, comes so near the Original as his, excepting

the *Spanish* of the *Jews* at *Ferrara*. He hath chosen rather to speak with less Elegancy, by retaining the *Hebraisms*, than to depart from his Text, having always preserv'd them entire, saving in some places, where the propriety of the *Spanish* Language could not admit them, and then they are describ'd in the Margent.

Besides all these precautions, which are very judicious, he hath inserted in his Translation, at least in the most obscure Books of the Scriptures, as in that of *Job*, in some of the *Psalms*, in the Books of *Solomon*, in those that are not extant in *Hebrew*, and even in the New Testament; certain additions not only of words but also of whole sentences, and hath included them between two Crotchets; Neither are these (according to his Opinion) so much additions, as the Text it self which is found to be different in divers Copies. He determin'd that it was requisite to specify them, that every one might be inform'd of this diversity. *Las (adiciones) pusimos a causa de la diversidad de los textos y de otras versiones*. Altho' this sort of additions may be a proof of the exactness of *Cassiodorus Reyna*, nevertheless he ought not to confound that which appertains to the Text with the ancient Versions, as he hath sometimes done, more especially in the New Testament, where these suppliments are sometimes taken from other *Greek* Copies, and sometimes from the ancient *Latin* Edition.

His New Testament is Entitled, *El Nuevo Testamento que es los Escriptos Evangelicos y Apostolicos*. To the end that we may be the better able to judge of his method, I shall here produce some passages of his Version. He hath literally Translated the first words of *St. Matthew*; *Libro de la generacion de Jesu Christo*, and hath express'd the 11. verse of the first Chapter of the same Gospel after this manner, which shews that there is a diversity in the *Greek* Copies. *Josias engendro [a Joacim y Joacim engendro] a Jeconias, y a sus hermanos en la transmigracion de Babylonia*: That which is included between two Crotchets is the addition taken from some *Greek* Copies.

However, he is not exact in marking all the various readings, neither does he maintain a sufficient uniformity therein; for some of them are describ'd in the Margent, as in Chap. 1. of *St. Mark*, vers. 2. where he reads according to the ordinary *Greek* Text, *en los Prophetas*; he hath plac'd in the Margent *ot. en Isayas Prophetas*, as it is express'd in the Vulgar, and in some ancient *Greek* MSS. Nevertheless this mark *ot.* shews rather the diversity of Interpretation, than a different reading; *Reyna* seems only to have consulted thereupon the *Latin* Versions, in which these variations are observ'd, and this is sometimes the cause of confusion in his Work.

The Explications which are found in the Margent of his Translation, consist for the most part in synonymous terms, or in such as are more generally known than those that remain in the Text of his Version. As for instance, in Chap. 3. of *St. Matthew*, vers. 2. where we read in the Vulgar

gar *penitentiam agite*, he hath render'd *emmiendaos*, and hath inserted in the Margent *ot. hazed penitencia*; and in vers. 8. where he hath interpreted, *fructos dignos de conversione*, he adds in the Margent, *o. de penitencia, o. de emmienda, o. de arrepentimiento*. In Chap. 6. vers. 7. he hath Translated these Greek words *μη βαττολογησατε*, thus, *seays prolixos*, placing over against them *o. parleros, habladores, estudiosos de oracion compuesta de palabras sin fe*.

He expounds in Chap. 10. of the same Gospel, vers. 4. the word *Isariota*, which he hath retain'd in his Version, by that of *varon de Cerioteb, a man of Cerioteb*. In Chap. 14. vers. 33. where he hath inserted *adoraron lo*, preserving the word *adore*, he explains it in the Margent by *bizieron la reverencia, they did reverence unto him*.

Moreover, he hath preserv'd in his Translation divers words which are in a manner consecrated, illustrating them at the same time by others that are more generally known, as that of *Escribas* by *Doctores*; that of *Synagoga* by *Ayuntamiento*; Nevertheless he sometimes (tho' seldom) makes use of this last in his Version. He likewise retains the word *Ecclesia*, *Iglesia*; and substitutes with the Ministers of Geneva Elders in the room of Priests. As for Example, in Chap. 14. of the *Acts*, vers. 23. it is read in his Translation, *y avendo les constituido Ancianos en cada una de las Iglesias*, and in the Margent *G. Presbyteros, q. d. Senado que los governasse christianamente*; In the Greek, *Priests, that is to say, a Senate which might govern them after a Christian manner*.

When he changeth a Greek word into another, he usually adds in the Margent that which is express'd in the Greek Text. As for instance, in Chap. 2. of the *Acts*, vers. 9. where he hath turn'd the name of *Elamites* into that of *Persians, Persas*, he placeth over against it *G. Elamitas*. In vers. 41. of the same Chapter, where he hath Translated according to the sense, *tres mil personas*, he adds in the Margent, *G. animas*, to signify that it is literally read in the Greek *three thousand Souls*. When he adheres in his Translation to the Grammatical Sense, if there happens any obscurity he illustrates it in the Margent by another word, as in Chap. 14. of the 1. Epistle to the *Corinth.* vers. 33. where he Interprets conformably to the Greek Original, *en todas las Iglesias de los Santos*, in all the Churches of the Saints, he hath inserted over against the words *de los Santos* that of *Christianos*, to shew that the Christians were called Saints.

Lastly, this Translator hath every where acted very prudently, having endeavour'd to express, as much as was possible, both in the body of his Version, and in his Annotations, that which he found in the Original: But notwithstanding the pains that he had taken during twelve years, which he declares to have been spent by him in accomplishing this Work, he is not always exact; by reason that not being capable of consulting the Originals himself, he was oblig'd to have recourse unto others, especially to the Annotations of the *Latin Bible* of *Leo Jude*, and to those that are contain'd in the ancient *French Versions* of *Geneva*.

As

As for the various Readings that are inserted by him in the Text of his Translation, and which he hath included between two Crotchets, it were more expedient to place them in the Margent; Besides that I cannot apprehend why he should be content only to exhibit some part of them, omitting others which might well deserve a particular remark. He hath not observ'd for Example any diversity of reading in Chap. 5. of the 1. Epistle of *St. John*, vers. 7. On the contrary he hath annex'd several variations of the Vulgar from the *Greek* Original, which ought not to be specified among the various readings: He reads for instance, in Chapter 5. of the Epistle to the *Galatians*, vers. 22. after these words, *mansedumbre, templança*, those others which are extant in the *Latin* Edition [*longanimidad, modestia, continencia, castidad.*]

Altho' the Author's name be not prefix'd at the beginning of this Bible, neither is there any mark to shew where it was first publish'd, nevertheless it appears from the figure of a Bear which is represented in the Title page embracing a Tree, that it was Printed at *Basil*, others affirm that it was at *Zurich*; However, it is certain that this Impression proceeded from *Germany*. There is a Sentence of Holy Scripture in *Hebren* at the beginning of the Book, Written in the *German* Character: Moreover the Author hath couch'd his name at the end of a *Latin* Preface under these two Letters *C. R.* which signify'd *Cassiodorus Reyna*.

This *Spaniard* hath apparently affected not to seem to be a Protestant to the end that his Version might be read by the *Roman* Catholics; and it is on this account, that he hath cited in the beginning of his Work this Rule of the *Index Expurgatorius*, as a Decree of the Council of *Trent*: *Cum experimento manifestum sit, si Sacra Biblia vulgari lingua, &c.* from whence he proves that the Versions of the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue are not absolutely prohibited. He afterwards adds under the authority of the same Council these other words which are extracted from the third Rule of the said *Index* of prohibited Books: *Si quæ verò annotationes cum hujusmodi quæ permittuntur versionibus circumferantur, expunctis locis suspectis à Facultate Theologica alicujus Universitatis Catholice, aut Inquisitione generali, permitti eisdem poterunt quibus & Versiones.*

Furthermore he gives thanks to God in his *Spanish* Preface for having inspir'd the Fathers of the Council of *Trent*, in the making of this Decree; the express words whereof he produceth in *Latin* and *Spanish*: *Tenemos y a bien materia, (says he) de que hazer gracias a Dios en esta parte que ha dado luz a los Padres del Concilio Tridentino para que advirtiendo mejor a esta causa, ayan puesto algun remedio en esto con su decreto.* He affirms likewise, that the aforesaid Decree is no less favourable to the *Spaniards* than to other Nations, and that therefore they have an equal right to read the Holy Scripture in their Mother-tongue, with the above-mention'd precautions.

Cassiodorus takes an occasion to discourse very much at large in this same Preface concerning the reading of the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue,

vigo-

*Cassiod. Reyn.
Sp. in. Pref.
to his Vers.*

vigorously by opposing those who condemn this sort of Versions. He maintains that the Holy Scriptures having been publish'd for the instruction of all Persons both Learned and Ignorant, the reading thereof cannot be prohibited without offering a manifest affront to God himself, and obstructing the Salvation of Men. To that which is usually objected, that the Sacred Books contain certain Mysteries which it is not convenient to divulge to all people; he replies (c) that the Mysteries of the true Religion ought to be seen and understood by all Mankind, because they are Light and Truth, and by reason that they relate to the Salvation of all, the first degree that tends to the obtaining thereof, is absolutely to know them.

Forasmuch as he hath conceal'd his name, and hath refus'd to be known, he durst not openly declare himself to be a Protestant; Nay, he seems even to affect the name of a *Roman* Catholick (d) since he professes to believe every thing that is established by the Catholick Church, being grounded on the authority of the Holy Scriptures, on the Decrees of the Sacred Councils, and on the *Apostolical*, *Nicene*, and *Athanasian* Creeds. Moreover, he is persuaded that they do an apparent injury to those that maintain this belief, who refuse to admit them as true Catholicks. But the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* all speak the very same Language; and nevertheless they are neither Catholicks nor Orthodox.

The New Testament of this *Spanish* Translator was afterward printed separately in the year 1596. *en casa de Ricardo del Campo*, without any other mark to shew the place where it was publish'd. The Revisers of this Impression have only made some few alterations of no moment, in the Text of the Version; they have likewise retrench'd a considerable part of the Notes that are contain'd in the Margent of the former Edition; neither have they retain'd the various readings which were included by *Reyna* between two Crotchets. Lastly, they have taken care only to express that which is found in the ordinary *Greek* Text, without regarding either the variations of the *Greek* Copies, or of the ancient *Latin* Edition.

The Publisher of this Edition of the New Testament in *Spanish* hath annex'd a Preface at the beginning thereof, in which he endeavours to prove by divers passages as well of the Old as of the New Testament,

(c) *Los misterios de la verdadera Religion*— *quieren ser vistos y entendidos de todos por que son luz y verdad: y por que siendo ordenados para la salud de todos el primero grado para alcanzar la necessariamente es conocer los.* Cassiod. Rey. Pref. Espagn. de la Vers.

(d) *Quanto a lo que toca al autor de la translacion, si Catholico es el que fiel y sencillamente cree y professa lo que sancta madre Iglesia Christiana, Catholica cree, tiene y mantiene determinado por Espiritu Sancto, por los Canones de la Divina Escripura en los sanctos Concilios y en los Symbolos y summas communes de la fe que llaman communemente el de los Apostolos, el de el Concilio Niceno, y el de Athanasio, Catholico es, y injuria manifesta le hara qui en no lo tuviere por tal.* Ibid.

Preface to
the Spanish
T. Printed
in 1596.

that the Bible ought to be Translated into the common Language of the People, to the end that it may be deliver'd indifferently into their hands, without any distinction of Age, Sex, or Quality, *sin hazer diferencia ninguna de sexo ni de edad ni de qualidad*. After having declar'd a few things even not very exactly concerning the ancient Translations in the Vulgar Tongue, he proceeds to those that were made for the use of his Nation. He affirms, that when the *Goths* had made themselves Masters of *Spain* the Holy Scriptures were Interpreted in their Language, on purpose that this Barbarous People might be converted to the Faith of JESUS CHRIST. But we have elsewhere observ'd, that the *Goths* themselves Translated the Bible into their own dialect, and that they were Christians at that time.

Ibid.

Moreover, he assures us, that during the subjection of *Spain* to the Dominion of the Moors, a certain Bishop of *Sevil* render'd the H. Scriptures into *Arabick*, that they might be instructed in the Christian Religion. *Reynando pues los Moros en Espanna un Obispo de Sevilla trasladd la Sagrada Escripura en lengua Arabica, para que los Moros subieffen qual era la Religion Christiana*. He adds, that King *Ferdinand* having conquer'd the Kingdom of *Granada*, and expell'd the *Moors*, the first Archbishop of those Territories was of Opinion, that a new *Arabick* Translation of all the Sacred Books, should be forthwith made for the use of those *Moors* that might be perswaded to embrace Christianity; the former Version being lost. But (e) *Francis Ximenes* (says he) Arch-bishop of *Toledo*, who Govern'd all things in *Spain*, prevented the execution of this pious Design, alledging only certain reasons that were merely Human, and contrary to the word of God. He opposeth against *Himenes*, the ancient Doctors of the Eastern and Western Churches, who have always exhorted the Faithful to read the Holy Scriptures. *Los Doctores antiquos assi Griegos como Latinos exhortan muy affectuosamente todos los fieles a que lean y meditan la Sagrada Escripura*. In a word, the *Genius* and Notions of *Cassiodorus Reyna*, are predominant throughout this whole Preface.

Ibid.

Furthermore, the Author produceth some examples to shew the care that was taken to exhibit nothing in this Translation, but that which is exact; and it is on this account that he hath interpreted in divers places the word *Χριστός* by that of *Mexias*. The word *Messias* (says he) being very common in our Language, we have thought fit to make use thereof in those places where it is taken for the name of an Office, *en los lugares que es nombre de officio*. whereas we have inserted that of *Jesus Christ*, wheresoever mention is made of the proper name of the Son

(e) A este tan pio intento se opuso Don Francisco Ximenes Arcobispo de Toledo que era el zodo en todo por toda Espanna alegando razones no tomadas de la palabra de Dios ni de lo que dixerón y hizieron los sanctos Doctores de la Iglesia, sino fabricadas por juyzio de hombre y por el consiguiente repugnantes a la palabra de Dios. Pref. du N. T. Espagn. impr. en. 1595.

of God, who was united to our Nature. He declares also that he hath express'd that which the *Grecians* call *Azymes*, that is to say *unleavened bread* by *Cecennas*, as being the peculiar word which the *Jews* of *Ferrara* have applied to this Sense in their *Spanish* Translation of the Old Testament.

I have nothing to add to the account that hath been already given in the Critical History of the Old Testament of *Cyprian de Valera's Spanish Bible*, which is merely a new Edition of that of *Cassiodorus Reyna*, corrected in some places. The *Portugal Jews* of *Amsterdam* read this Version rather than that of *Ferrara*, because it is more intelligible. The New Testament was afterward Printed separately with the ensuing Title: *El Nuevo Testamento que es los Escriptos Evangelicos y Apostolicos revisito y conferido con el texto Griego por Cypriano de Valera.* The New Testament, that is to say, the *Evangelical and Apostolical Writings*, revis'd and compar'd with the Greek Text, by *Cyprian de Valera*. At Amst. in 1625.

Besides the above-cited Editions which I have perus'd, mention is made in a Collection of several Tracts Printed at *Paris* by the order of an Assembly of the Clergy, against the Versions of the Bible and Ecclesiastical Offices in the Vulgar Tongue, of a *Spanish* Translation of the New Testament, which was sent by the Parliament of *Paris* to the Faculty of Theology residing in the same City to be examin'd by them. The aforesaid Reverend Doctors censur'd therein a certain Note on these words of *St. Matthew*, Chap. 19. vers. 21. *Si vis perfectus esse, vade, vende quæ habes, & da pauperibus*, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, which was thus express'd, *Hoc præceptum ad hunc solum adolescentem pertinet ad patefaciendam illius hypocrisim*, This precept appertain'd only to that Young man, to discover his Hypocrisy. The reason alledg'd by them for their Censure, is, that by this remark which was taken from the *Geneva Bibles*, our Saviour's words were perversly wrested to a contrary sense.

C H A P. XLII.

Of the Versions in the Vulgar Tongue which were compos'd for the use of the People of Great Britain, and first of the English-Saxon. Of several English Translations, and of one in the Irish Language.

THE Hiltorians of *England* make mention of certain parts of the Bible Translated in the beginning of the VIII. Century into the Vulgar Tongue, which was then the *Saxon*; some of them attribute to *Bede* an entire Version of the Holy Scriptures, and others only that of the Gospel according to *St. John*: There are others also who affirm that *Adelmus* Bishop of *Sherbon* who liv'd about the year of our Lord 705. was the Author of a *Saxon* Translation of the Book of *Psalms*; they likewise ascribe an Interpretation of the *Psalter* in the same Language to King

Alfred, who Reign'd two hundred years after that time. But forasmuch as there is little certainty concerning these matters, and since they are not confirm'd by any authentick Records, it were needless to insist on them. We may thereupon consult the Preface which is prefix'd to the Observations on a Version of the Old and New Testament, printed at London Anno Dom. 1657. in folio, wherein are collected the discourses of Mr. *John Fox* and of divers other English Writers, concerning the Bibles of their Nation.

Mr. *Marshall* who publish'd certain Annotations on the *English-Saxon* Gospels which were printed at *Dort*, Anno Dom. 1665. hath likewise discours'd of the *English* Bibles. Dr. *Matthew Parker* Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* had caus'd these Gospels to be printed at *London* in the year 1571. and Mr. *John Spelman* set forth an Edition of the Psalter at the same place in the aforesaid Language, from an ancient Manuscript which he had corrected by three other MSS. Copies: Insomuch that it cannot be doubted that the people of Great Britain, at least some part of them, had in their possession several Translations of the Old and New Testament in their Mother-Tongue.

However, the Psalter that we have even now mention'd, appears rather to be a literal Gloss than a continual Version. *Monendus es lector*, (says Mr. *Spelman*) *non hic reperiri integrum aut genuinum sermonis Saxonici contextum, sed ad singula verba Latina, verbales tantummodo versiones*: Which proves that this sort of Translations was only compos'd for the use of the People, on the account that they did not understand the Psalms and the other parts of the Offices which were recited in *Latin* in their Churches. Therefore we find in Mr. *Spelman's* Copy at the end of every Psalm a Prayer in that Tongue; this is read for Example, at the end of Psalm 19. *Da nobis auxilium de sancto, memor esto omnis sacrificii nostri, &c.*

It was natural that these Prayers, which all related to the Psalms whereto they were annex'd, should be directed immediately to God; therefore there can be nothing more absurd than the reflection of the same Mr. *Spelman*, who infers from thence, that no Invocation was then made in these Churches to the Virgin *Mary*, nor to the Saints, and that the Cross was not therein ador'd. *Eas (preces) say he, una publicandas aquum duximus, tum ut librum ipsum fideliter rectemus, tum ut antiquioris Ecclesia Anglicana praxim sinceram ob oculos ponamus, qua sub illo tempore, ut videtur, beatorum animas, nec beatissimam Virginem Mariam, nec crucem Domini adorandas docuit. Namque inter preces plus minus 170. ne minima quidem intercessio reperitur, nisi qua soli Deo immediate prestat.*

As for the *English-Saxon* Gospels, they are rather different portions of several Translations, than a single Version, as is observ'd by Mr. *Marshall*, who believes also, that that of the Gospel according to St. *Matthew*, is the Work of two distinct Interpreters. *Quinetiam*, (says this Learned Critick) *vel unum S. Matthæi Evangelium duos videri habuisse Interpretes.* The Antiquity of this *English-Saxon* Version is evidently apparent, in regard

Spelm. Pref.
in Psalt.
Anglo-Sax.

Spelm. ibid.

Tho. Marosc.
Observ. in
Verf. Ang.
Sax. p. 490.

gard that it is conformable in some places to the ancient *Latin* Edition that was read in the Western Churches, before St. *Jerom's* Correction was generally admitted.

There is extant a considerable addition in Chap. 20. of St. *Matthew*, between the 28. and 29. Verses, after the same manner as in the *Cambridge* Copy which represents (as I have elsewhere shewn) the ancient *Vulgar*. The new Edition of St. *Jerom* apparently was not as yet us'd in the Churches of *England*, when this *English-Saxon* Version of the Gospels was written. Many other Examples of this Conformity with the Manuscript of *Cambridge*, and consequently with the old *Latin* Edition are found in Mr. *Marshall's* Observations, especially in the three first Gospels; for he hath not perceiv'd the same Conformity in that according to St. *John*, which induc'd him to believe that the Version of this last Evangelist, was taken from a Copy of a later date than the *Vulgar*. In fine, forasmuch as these Translations of the New Testament were only deliver'd into the hands of the People in their proper Language, to the end that they might understand that which was read in *Latin* in the Churches, it was necessary to correct the ancient Versions, or to compose others anew, when St. *Jerom's* Edition was substituted in the room of the old *Vulgar*.

The whole Bible was likewise Translated into *English* by Mr. *John Wicklief*, but his Version was afterward condemn'd in a Provincial Council holden at *Oxford* under Arch-Bishop *Arundel*. If we may give credit to the testimony of Dr. B. he had prefix'd to his Translation a very large Preface, in which he declam'd with a great deal of liberty against the vices of the Ecclesiastical persons of those times; he disallow'd the Invocation of Saints, and the Worshipping of Images; he denied the Corporal presence of JESUS CHRIST in the Sacrament; Lastly, he exhorted all People to the reading and study of the Holy Scriptures.

Dr. B. Hist.
of the Ref. of
the Church
of England.
Book 1.

Moreover, *Wicklief's* Memory and Books were again censur'd under the Reign of King *Henry VIII.* and it is on this account, that his Bible is at present very rarely to be found; Nevertheless in the Preface to the above-mention'd *English* Observations, certain Libraries of *England* are nam'd wherein it is as yet extant even at this day. Other Versions of the Bible in the *English* Tongue were also made during the life of this Prince, the reading whereof was for a time permitted unto the People, but they were afterward absolutely prohibited. *Arnoldus Bootius* speaks to this effect after M. *Fox*, who hath likewise discours'd at large concerning the present matter, in his Book of Martyrs. (a) There were ex-

(a) Sunt versiones Anglica omnibus istis antiquiores, ac jam sub regno Henrici VIII. facta auctoribus Tindal, Mattheures aliisque, qui non modo usum ejus populo permisit, quando Cromwellus in gratia apud eum fuit, sed & ejusdem instinctu jussit publico decreto, ut in omnibus per totum regnum templis singula ejus exemplaria publice haberentur, obnitentibus valide Episcopis, qui postea quoque sublato de medio Cromwello, non modo irritum reddiderunt hoc decretum, sed & novum a Rege obtinuerunt, quo omnia istarum versionum exemplaria verabantur a quocumque haberi, & flammis adjudicabantur. Boot. in Ind. Auct. qui præmitt. Animad. Sac. ad Text. V. T.

tant Translations of the Bible in *English* even in the time of *Henry VIII.* who not only allow'd that they should be read by the People, but also commanded (being incited thereto by Sir *Thomas Cromwell*) that Copies of them should be distributed throughout all the Churches of his Kingdom, notwithstanding the opposition of the Bishops, who obtain'd nevertheless of the King, after *Cromwell's* death, a general prohibition against those Bibles, which were afterwards burnt.

Durel. Vin. Eccles. Angl. c. 27.
Fox Martyr. vol. edit. Basil. p. 138.
 The first of these Translations is that of the New Testament compos'd by *William Tindal* in the year 1530. according to the report of Mr. *Fox* and Dr. *Durel*; the later of whom attributes unto him a Version of the Pentateuch alone, not believing that he Translated the whole Old Testament, as M. *Fox* seems to insinuate, when he declares that M. *William Tindal* was Educated during the time of his Youth in the University of *Oxford*, and that having applied himself to the reading of Mr. *Luther's* Books, he Interpreted the Old and New Testament in *English* with his Friend M. *John Friib*: Dr. *B.* assures us that this Translation of the New Testament made by *Tindal* was Printed at *Amwerp* in the year 1526. together with certain short Notes.

Fox ibid.
 Mr. *Tindal* afterward publish'd a second Edition more exact than the former. (b) *Cuthbert Tunstall* Bishop of *London* gave occasion to this new Edition, who intending entirely to express the aforesaid *English* New Testament bought all the Copies thereof, to which purpose he employ'd a certain Merchant nam'd *Augustin Packington*, who being *Tindal's* Friend, discover'd the whole affair to him, and convey'd into his hands all the Money that he had receiv'd of the Bishop on this account. Forasmuch as *Tindal* was assisted by *Miles Coverdale*, this Version was likewise call'd *Coverdale's Bible*; Moreover it was revis'd by *Thomas Matthews*, who set forth a new Edition thereof A. D. 1537. according to the testimony of Dr. *Durel*, who conjectures nevertheless that *Matthews* is a supposititious name.

Hist. of the Reform. Book 3.
 It is related by Dr. *B.* that in the year 1538. Sir *Thomas Cromwell* being Vicar-General to King *Henry VIII.* presented to him the *English Bible* printed by *Grafton*, and that he obtain'd a grant of this Prince, that it might be read by all sorts of Persons; Another Impression thereof began to be made at *Paris* with the License of *Francis I.* but it was soon stopt upon the complaint of the Clergy of *France*, whereupon the most

(b) *Episcopus Londinensis Cuthbertus Tunstallus non vulgariter eâ de re (de Novo Testamento Tyndalli) sollicitus, consilium caprat cum mercatore quodam Augustino Pakyngtono de abolendis his Novi Testamenti libris. Ille cum Tyndallo clam faveret, Episcopo hoc dabat consilii, nempe si exponeretur tanta pecuniarum summa, quanta sat esset cœmendâ omnibus ejus impressionis exemplaribus, facile futurum ut hujusmodi libri ad unum omnes tollerentur. Nec mora, arrepto mox consilio pecuniam exposuit Episcopus. Mercator acceptam Tyndallo nunc exulanti ad assem protinus universam tradidit, ex quo factum est ut Tyndallo suppetere non solum quod sibi ceterisque ad victum sufficeret, sed quo majori etiam diligentia & librorum copia secundam posset adornare. Fox Hist. Martyr. edit. Basil. p. 138.*

part of the Copies were seiz'd and publickly burnt. Afterward King Henry set forth a rigorous Edict against these Versions, absolutely forbidding all his Subjects of whatsoever quality to keep in their possession the New Testament Translated by *Tindal* or *Coverdale*, or any other English Book bearing the names of *Frith*, *Tindal*, *Wicklief*, *Coverdale*, &c. The Learned Sir *Thomas More*, who was persuaded that such Translations in the Vulgar Tongue could introduce at that time nothing but disorder into the Church and State of *England*, was one of those who solicited King Henry for the publishing of this Proclamation.

However, this hinder'd not but that there still remain'd some Copies of the Bible of *Tindal* and *Coverdale*, which was reviv'd under the Reign of King *Edward VI.* when the Protestant Religion began to be Establish'd in *England*. The Author of the Preface inserted at the beginning of the Annotations on the Bible printed at *London* in 1657. affirms that the Version of *Tindal* or *Coverdale* was publickly read in the time of this Prince throughout the Churches of *England*; by reason that the Psalter which is as yet extant in the Book of Common-Prayer, is the same as that which is found in this Translation, which he likewise avoucheth concerning the Epistles and Gospels: But Dr. *Durel* shews the contrary with respect to *Tindal*, in regard that he did not Translate the Psalms. As for that of *Coverdale*, he is of Opinion, that his Version of the Psalms differs from that which is contain'd in the *English* Liturgy, and he avers the same thing with reference to the Translation of *Matthews*.

Durel. ibid.

Forasmuch as (c) those Bibles were not generally approv'd, it was decreed by the Authority of Henry VIII. that a new Translation should be compos'd, and that it should likewise be plac'd in the Churches to the end that every one might peruse the Sacred Books. The King committed this undertaking to the care of *Cuthbert Tunstal* then Bishop of *Durham*, and *Nicholas Heath* Bishop of *Rocheſter*, who publish'd their Version in the year 1541. and from thence (according to Dr. *Durel's* Opinion) was taken the Translation of the Psalms which is included in the *English* Book of Common Prayer. But at length (d) this Prince perceiving that

(c) Cum neque Coverdalis, neque Matthæi, neque alia cuiuscunque versio ullâ auctoritate publicâ niteretur, cumque in iis omnibus nonnulla displicerent, anno 1540. regiâ auctoritate decretum est, ut recenseretur & de novo recuderetur Sacrorum Bibliorum versio in usum non privatum modo, sed quodammodo publicum, scilicet ut essent in qualibet Ecclesiâ quedam exemplaria locis idoneis disposita, quæ cuius etiam è plebe Sacras Scripturas legendi cupido paterent. Prodiit igitur anno 1541. nova SS. Bibliorum editio Anglica, accurantibus Cuthberto Tunstallo Dunelmensi & Nicolao Heath Rossensi Episcopis. viris doctissimis, quibus ea provincia à Rege demandata fuerat, prout fert prima pagina. *Durel. Vind. Ec. Angl. c.27.*

(d) Paulo post tempore, anno scilicet 1542. Ordinum decreto regiâ auctoritate sancito, cum Rex ipse licet Pontifici Romano infensus, Pontificiæ Religionî, cui semper fuit addictissimus ad extremum usque halitum, à Scripturis Sacris, si vulgo legerentur, non parum metueret, earum versiones, non modo eas quæ à Coverdalis aliisque qui Protestantium reformationi favere putabantur, sed omnes ex æquo, ne exceptâ quidem Dunelmensis ac Rossensis editione, prohiberi sunt. Nec cuiquam exinde ad usque Eduardi Regis Sexti regnum, nisi ex speciali Regis Ordinariæ indulgentiâ, Scripturam Sacram vulgari idiomate legere imphne licuit. *Durel. ibid.*

even the Version of these two Bishops which was made by his Order, *Darel. ibid.* might introduce the Innovations of the Protestants into his Kingdom, prohibited them all within a little while after; insomuch that it was not permitted to any person whatsoever, during the whole remainder of his Reign, to read the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue, without obtaining a special License to this purpose from his Majesty or the Ordinary.

Under the Reign of *Edward VI.* who succeeded *Henry VIII.* and embraced the Protestant Religion, *Dr. Thomas Cranmer* Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* set forth a new Edition of the Translation of *Tunstal* and *Heath*, together with a Preface at the beginning thereof; and in regard that the body of the Liturgy of the Church of *England* was Compil'd in the time of this Prince, the Psalter which is inserted therein was taken from that Version; it is call'd by the *English* the ancient Interpretation of the Psalms, to distinguish it from another of a later date made under the Reign of King *James I.* This Old Version of the Psalter is retain'd by them even at this very day, altho' it is less exact than the Modern.

Moreover, there is another Translation of the Bible in the *English* Tongue, which differs very much from the preceding. Queen *Mary* having re-establish'd the *Roman* Catholick Religion in *England*, some Protestants addicted to the *Puritan* Sect retir'd to *Geneva*, where being desirous to serve God according to their own custom, they compos'd a particular Liturgy, which varied from that of this City, and a new Translation of the Bible in *English*, together with Observations after their manner. The first Edition is that of the year 1560. and, I have seen another printed at *London* in 1598. with the Privilege of Queen *Elizabeth*: It is express'd in the Title thereof, that this Version as well of the Old as of the New Testament, was taken from the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Originals, and compar'd with the most accurate Translations in several Languages.

The Names of those who took pains in rendring this Bible compleat, are not specified in the beginning thereof. *Bootius* who hath cited it in his Critical Remarks on the *Hebrew* Text of the Old Testament (e) mentions three of the principal Translators, viz. *Miles Coverdale*, *William Whittingham*, and *Anthony Gilbie*, who spent two whole years in accomplishing this Work, whereto they constantly applied themselves with very

(e) *Anglica versio Genevensis adornata fuit Geneva, unde & nomen accepit ab Anglis ibi sub persecutione Mariana exulantibus. E quorum numero tres præcipui ac doctissimi, Miles Coverdale, William Whittingham & Antonie Gilbie, totum biennium insumpserunt huic operi, ac Scripturæ Sacræ in linguam patriam transferendæ graviter admodum vigilarunt, & versionem suam ad umbilicum perductam typis vulgaverunt anno 1560. suppressis nominibus, quæ versio deinceps sæpius in Angliâ recusa est. Quippe quæ toto Regina Elisabethæ tempore in omnium manibus frustra excutere nitentibus Episcopis parum ipsi æquis, quia ab hominibus Hierarchiam Ecclesiasticam aversantibus concinnata erat, suamque editionem pro eâ ingerentibus, quam quidem in templis inque publicâ Liturgiâ inroduxerant, in cuius formulis hodieque liber Psalmorum habetur ex istâ translatione. Boot. in Ind. Auctor.*

great diligence. He adds moreover, that divers Editions thereof were publish'd in *England* in the time of *Queen Elizabeth*, notwithstanding the opposition of the Bishops, by whom it was condemn'd, as being Compos'd by men that were averse to Ecclesiastical Hierarchy; besides that design of these Prelates was to cause their own Translation to be us'd by the People, which they had already introduc'd into the publick Service of their Churches.

But the Bishops were not able to suppress this *English Bible of Geneva*, during the whole Reign of *Queen Elizabeth*, by reason that the *Presbyterian* Party, which was very numerous, prefer'd it before all others. This is the Translation which was mention'd by King *James I.* when he declar'd that of all the Editions of the Bible none was more Corrupt than that of *Geneva*; but this Censure chiefly relates to the Annotations which contain (if we may give credit to *Dr. Darel*) many things that are Fanatical and injurious to the Church of *England*, and to the other reformed Churches; and this is that which hath caus'd the aforesaid *Geneva Bible* to be so much detried in *England*, *Ab iisdem*, (says he) *Anglis exulibus Darel Vind. edita sunt nota in Sacra Biblia Anglico idiomate, in quibus cum multa occurrant admodum fanatica, & Ecclesia Anglicana aliisque Ecclesiis reformatis injuriosa, inde factum, ut tam male audiant apud nos Nota Genevenses & Biblia Genevensis.* *Eccles. Angl.*

However, (as we have even now observ'd) it was only censur'd by those who are commonly call'd the Episcopal Party, on the account that the Translators thereof maintain the Opinions of the Inhabitants of *Geneva*, with respect to Church-Government, and prefer'd that of Common-wealths before the Regiment of Monarchical States. The *Presbyterians*, otherwise styl'd *Puritans*, have always retain'd these Republican Principles. *Mr. Leti* who distinguishes in his History of Great *Britain* two sorts of *Presbyterians* in *Scotland*, viz. the Episcopal, *Vescovali*, and the *Puritans*, *Presbyteriani Puritani*, affirms in speaking of the latter (f) that they very strictly adhere to all the Maxims of the *Calvinists* of *France* and *Geneva*, and that it is impossible to dissuade them from this practice by any arguments that can be alledg'd. The necessity of the present conjuncture of affairs (continues he) obligeth them to express a great deal of respect for Monarchy, altho' in the bottom of their hearts, they are altogether inclin'd to a Democracy, which they imagine to be more suitable to the regular Government of the Church. Thus this difference in Opinions hath divided the minds of the People as to the approbation of their *English Bibles*.

(f) Questi (*Presbyteriani Puritani*) conservano con sommo rigore le massime e gli esercizi de' Protestanti di Francia e di *Geneva*, de' quali non si parterebbono per qual si sia ragione o persuasiva. La necessit  delle congiunture de' tempi l'obliga   testimoniar gran rispetto per la Monarchia, ancor che nell' animo habbino impressa una certa specie di governo popolare, che credono consarsi meglio al bon governo della Chiesa. *Leti, Teatr. Brittan. parte 4. lib. 3. p. 253.*

The Episcopal party in the time of Queen *Elizabeth* read a Version which was compos'd in the beginning of the Reign of this Princess, by Dr. *Parker* Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, who was assisted by divers Learned Men, well skill'd in the knowledge of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Tongues. It was call'd the *Bishops Bible*; but King *James I.* could not entirely approve this Translation (g) because it was not sufficiently conformable to the *Hebrew* Text, and in regard that it sometimes follow'd the ancient *Greek* Version of the *Septuagint*; neither could he endure the *English* of *Geneva*, by reason of certain Notes that were not favourable to the Arbitrary Power of Kings; wherefore he commanded that a new one should be forthwith made. But if this Prince had no other motives to induce him to reject the Episcopal Bible, only because it came too near to the Translation of the ancient *Grecian* Interpreters, he ought not to have substituted another in its room: For these Interpreters have not departed so far from the *Hebrew* Original as is generally believ'd by the Protestants; besides that the present *Hebrew* is not an infallible Rule; and the same thing may also be averr'd concerning the Vulgar *Greek* Text of the New Testament, whereto those of the Reformed Religion have adher'd with too much exactness in their Versions.

The same defect is obvious in King *James's* Edition, as that which is common to all the Translations of the Protestants, who scarcely acknowledge any other *Hebrew* Text than that of the *Masorete Jews*, nor any *Greek* saving that of the Ordinary Copies; the first Edition of this Royal Bible so call'd by the *English*, was printed in the year 1612. They all avouch that it is more exact than the preceding, as being more conformable to the Originals; however *Bootius* hath observ'd that (b) altho' it was generally admitted in the Churches, and was deliver'd into the hands of the People; Nevertheless it could not entirely abolish that of *Geneva*, which was as yet read by many, whereas the Episcopal Bible is altogether buried in Oblivion, being very rarely to be found any where but in some well furnish'd Libraries. It is probable that the Notes which are annex'd to the *English* Version of *Geneva* illustrating the difficulties of the Text, have very much contributed to the preserving thereof. King *James I.* who well understood that the Protestant Divines were apt frequently to obtrude their Notions in the Holy Scripture, under colour of adding remarks, wou'd not suffer any to be inserted in his Edition.

(g) Hanc editionem ob id quia non semper Hebraicam veritatem strictè sequitur, nonnullisque in locis, dedita opera ad Graecam versionem se attemperat, loco movendam cum censisset Rex *Jacobus*, neque tamen Genevensem admittere vellet, summopere ipsi infestus ob unum alterumque in scholiis locum regia potestati adversusque, parum faventem, novam de integro fieri curavit ope diversorum virorum, quorum cuique suum pensum attributum erat. Boot. in Ind. Auctor.

(b) Haec translatio Regia à nobis dicta, quia jussu Regis *Jacobi* facta, licet & in templis sit recepta, & in populi manibus versetur, Genevensim tamen abolere prorsus non potuit, quippe quâ adhuc plurimi passim utantur, cum editio Episcopalis omnino exolverit, atque oblitterata sit, adeo ut rarissimè, & fere non nisi in instructiore aliquâ Bibliotheca conspiciatur. Boot. Ibid.

Besides

Besides all these Versions of the Holy Scriptures in English, Bootius informs us of another of the whole Bible in the ancient Language of this Country, which was Printed at London, Cimbrica, (says he) *Britannica five Walica quæ anno 1588. Londini prodit*: Moreover he makes mention (i) of a Translation of the New Testament in the Irish Tongue, publish'd by Sir W. Usher of Dublin, who employ'd an able person in the performing of this Work, defray'd the Charges of the Impression, and distributed many Copies of them gratis, his design being to excite his Country-men to the reading of the Sacred Books, imagining thereby to lead them out of that Labarynth of Error, wherein he believ'd that they were involv'd.

He likewise mentions in the same place Dr. William Bedel an Englishman by Nation, and Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland, who caus'd the whole Old Testament to be Translated out of Hebrew into the Language of this Countrey; having assign'd to this charge certain persons who perfectly understood the English and Irish Tongues. Dr. B. who has lately publish'd the Life of this Bishop, discourseth at large concerning this Irish Version of the Old Testament. He informs us that Dr. Bedel, with the advice of his Primate and some others, made use of the service of one nam'd King in this affair, who pass'd at that time for the most accurate Writer in the Irish Tongue both in Prose and Verse.

This man who had no knowledge of the Hebrew Tongue, applied himself to the Interpreting of the English Version, which serv'd him instead of the Original; afterward the Bishop of Kilmore revis'd his Irish Translation, comparing it with the English, and this later with the Hebrew Text and the Septuagint Version, as also sometimes with the Italian of Diodati which was very much esteem'd by him. The Roman Catholics of Ireland, having known the Author, rejected this Translation, nay they even declar'd to the Protestant Party, that a Bible of this nature would not redound to their Credit; and indeed, there is little probability that it could be exact after the same manner as it was Written. But Dr. B. the most part of whose Books are full of Controversy, would willingly persuade us that the Catholics had another design in endeavouring to prevent the publishing of the Irish Bible; *The Priests (says he) of the Communion of the Church of Rome, had reason to oppose the Printing of a Book, which hath always prov'd fatal to them.*

Dr. B. Life
of Bishop
Bedel.

Bishop Bedel being thus vigorously thwarted, and even oblig'd to justify his proceedings with respect to the Translator whom he had chosen, was not able to procure the Printing of this Work, which he judg'd to be so necessary for the promoting of the Protestant Doctrines in Ireland.

(i) *Hibernica cujus Novum Testamentum ante multos annos prodit, cum Wilhelmus O'Serius Dublinensis Eques Auratus, a viro docto quem domi alebat eam fieri ac propriis impensis excudi curavisset, ut popularibus suis, quos in densis errorum tenebris versari videbat ac dolebat, consideret, viamque ad salutem eis aperiret, in quem finem etiam pleraque omnia exemplaria gratis distribuit.* Boot. Ital.

Dr. B. ibid. But we are since inform'd that the MS. of this Version being fallen into good hands, is as yet preserv'd entire; forasmuch as *Care is taken* (says he) *at present for the Printing thereof, thro' the diligence of that illustrious Christian Philosopher Mr. R. B. who having supplied the Charges of the Impression of the New Testament, hath chearfully undertaken the management of that of the Old.* If *Dr. B.* would vouchsafe to reflect on all that hath been above related concerning the Translations of the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue publish'd by the Catholicks, I am perswaded that for the future he will have a better opinion of the Priests of the Communion of the Church of Rome.

In 1663. The People of Ireland had reason to fear, lest the Bishop of *Kilmore's* Version should introduce into their Country the Fanaticism that is predominant among their Neighbours: But after all, if the *Irish* Catholicks are desirous to read the Bible in their own Language, they ought to imitate their Brethren of *England*, who have in their possession a Translation of all the Holy Scriptures in their Mother-Tongue, compos'd by Orthodox Divines from the ancient *Latin* Edition. Lastly, the *English* have Printed at *Cambridge* a Version of the whole Bible in the *Indian* Language for the use of the Natives of *New-England*.

C H A P. XLIII.

Of the Versions of the New Testament in the German Tongue, especially of that which was Compos'd by Martin Luther, as being the Original of the most part of the other Versions of the Northern People. Of the Flemish Translations.

WE have elsewhere shewn that the *Germans* were furnish'd with Versions of the Holy Scriptures, before that of *M. Luther*, and that the Gospels and Epistles read in their Churches throughout the whole Year, together with the *Postills* or Brief Notes for the instruction of the People, were Translated as well in *Germany*, as in *France*, *Italy*, and *Spain*. The Translation of this Northern Doctor no sooner appear'd in the World, but the *Roman* Catholicks set up others in opposition thereto; for *Emserus* Interpreted the New Testament in *High-Dutch*, and *Dietsbergius* the whole Bible in the same Language; and these Versions are extant even at this day among the Catholicks, who peruse them without any scruple. *Nicholas Scheten* a German Jesuit in a Book, Entituled, *Carolus Magnus Romanorum Imperator & Francorum Rex Romano-Catholicus*, solidly confutes a certain *Lutheran* Preacher, who gave it out that the reading of the Sacred Books was prohibited in the Diocess of *Paderborn*, and that this prohibition was generally observ'd among all the *Roman* Catholicks.

Edit. Neugessii anno 1674.

If this were true (says the aforefaid Jesuit) (a) Why were any Versions of the H. Scriptures Compos'd in High Dutch, before that of *Luther*? Wherefore hath *Dieterbergius* undertaken to Translate after him? To what purpose is the Version of *Vlenbergius*, at present in the possession of all the People? Lastly, on what account hath the Arch-Bishop of *Mentz* lately publish'd a new German Translation of the Bible? He thereupon cites *Laymannus*, who avouches, that it is universally permitted to all persons in *Germany*, to read the Sacred Writings in the Vulgar Tongue; and that the Versions of Hereticks were only forbidden, which he confirms by the testimony of *Serarius*, who declares, that they were so far from being punish'd, that apply'd themselves to the Study of the H. Scriptures in this Country; that on the contrary, it was determin'd that those persons ought to be commended who read the Versions of *Eckius* and *Dieterbergius*, *Tantum abesse quo minus puniantur apud Catholicos, ut laudandi etiam sint qui Versionem Eckii & Dieterbergii legunt.* Id ibid. ex Proleg. ser. rar.

In fine, the Jesuit *Seebten* convinceth his adversary of Falshood, even by the practice of the Diocess of *Paderborn* (b) where the Roman Catholics peruse the Bible with the same liberty, as the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* among the Protestants; he adds likewise that this custom hath prevail'd in the *Low Countrys*, and throughout all *Germany*, whence he concludes, that the later who make these objections to the former, are very much mistaken. Moreover, this hath been the constant practice in *Germany*, both before and after the time of *Luther*, and continues even at this very day. Ibid.

D. Martin Luther began his Translation of the Bible, with the Books of the New Testament, the Version whereof he publish'd in the year 1522. being revis'd by *Philip Melancthon*. His followers extol their Master's Bible, chiefly because (c) it is clear and intelligible, whereas the other German Versions, which were made before him, are so obscure, and written in so barbarous a Style, that they cannot be understood; besides that the Vulgar is therein represented. *Melancthon* commends this Translation principally on the account of its pure and elegant Style, insomuch that it

(a) Quorsum Germanici idiomatis versio ante Lutherum? Quorsum deinde Vulgata Versio Dieterbergii? Quorsum Vlenbergii omnium manibus apud nos teritur? Quorsum Archi-episcopus Moguntinus Biblia Germanice recens versa & typis novis expressa vulgavit? Nicol. Schat. lib. I. Tract. de princip. fid. c. 2.

(b) Legunt cives Paderbornenses & omnes Dioecesis incolae tam libere Biblia apud nos, quam apud vos Lutheranos & Calvinistas; sed quae versionis probatae tantummodo sunt, & ab haeresi incorrupta. Quod cum per Belgium & totam Germaniam fieri videatis, quae mentiendi impudent & scribitis & declamatis apud plebem, Catholicis probiberi lectionem Bibliorum? Id. Ibid.

(c) Extabant enim jam tum quaedam Scripturarum versiones Germanicae, sed huic scopo minus accommodatae. Praeterquam enim quod ex versione Latini & translatae, & velut rivi ex vivo turbido derivati minus pure fluebant. Quia genus dicendi etiam erat horridae, obscurae, barbarae, ut multis in locis quid vellent vix Germanorum, Tullius quisquis esset, assequeretur. Jo. Mus. Praef. in Vind. Bibl. Luth. adv. Erber.

might serve instead of a Commentary. *Interpretatio Veteris & Novi Testamenti (Lutheri) in qua tanta est perspicuitas, ut vice Commentarii esse possit ipsa Germanica lectio.* But it frequently happens in this kind of Versions, that under pretence of rendring a clear and intelligible Sense, the particular Notions of private persons are rather exhibited, than the Genuine expressions of the Holy Ghost, and this defect is every where conspicuous throughout *Luther's* whole Bible.

His Disciples who cannot deny a matter of Fact that is so evident, are oblig'd to acknowledge, that their Master hath in many places perform'd the Function of a Paraphrast, rather than that of a simple Translator.

Raith. Vind. Verf. Germ. Luth. rh. 10. *Ratione verborum & rerum concedimus Lutherum multis in locis non tam metaphrastem quam paraphrastem.* They affirm at the same time, that an Interpreter ought not too scrupulously to render the words of his Text, producing on their behalf these passages of *Horace*, *Nec verbum verbo curabis reddere, fidus interpres*; Nor word for word too faithfully Translate, *E. of Roscomm*, which indeed is true; but neither ought we to take too much liberty on this account, and there is a certain mean to be us'd between *Luther's* manner of Interpreting, and those Versions that are too literal.

M. Flacius Illyricus a famous Protestant, who well understood this method, avoucheth that the aforesaid Sentence of *Horace* cannot be applied to a Translation of the H. Scriptures, *non in vertendo Sacra Codice tanta libertas.* (d) On the contrary, he requires that the words of the Sacred Text should be literally represented, without rejecting any as useless, and asserts, that it is not lawful to express them by way of Paraphrase, or to introduce such a Sense as the Interpreter shall judge to be most proper and convenient. He seems to have had no other intent in this, than to decry the *High-Dutch Bible* of *Luther*, who under pretence of not being bound to the very words of his Original Book, Compos'd a Translation according to his own particular *Idea*. Moreover, he thereby condemns all the *Lutheran Apologists*, who notwithstanding this defect, which is considerable, do not forbear to maintain that their Version is faithful as to the Sense; that it is clear, and written in a pure Style; and Lastly, that it may serve as a Paraphrase or Commentary in these passages wherein there appears any difficulty. *Illam textus originalis sententiam fideliter exprimere, sermone constare perspicuo, puritatem lingua tueri, & in locis difficilioribus paraphraseos & Commentarii operam prestare.*

Raithius, who is one of their most able Criticks, and whose mind is full of such prejudicate Notions as are common to all those of his Sect,

(d) *Hic enim veriores quilibet religiosius quam in aliis scriptis versari coguntur; ita ut etiam singulas voces exprimant, nec vel prætermittant aliquas tanquam superfluas, vel etiam liberiori copiosiorique sermone sensu pro suo arbitrio offerant.* *Illyr. Clav. Script. part. 2. tract. 6. tit. de Rud. ling. Hebr.*

hath presum'd to place *Luther's Bible* in the rank of the most accurate Translations of the *H. Scripture*; *Assēverare non veremur*, (says he) *eam inter optimas quæ unquam solam viderunt ponendam, cum nihil quod humana præstari operâ poterat in eâ concinnandâ fuerit omissum voluntarie scienterque.* *Raith. Vind. Verf. Germ. Luth. th. 12.* I am apt to believe that *Luther* hath not willingly omitted any thing that might tend to the rendring of his Version complete and exact: but the matter in debate, is to know whether he were really capable to perform an undertaking of so great importance, and whether he had acquir'd a sufficient knowledge of the *Hebrew* and *Greek Tongues*, and of the Style of the Sacred Writings, which is requisite for the Composing of an accurate Translation of these Originals; but the most Learned Men of his time have not perceiv'd that he was endued with these qualifications, nay, he seems rather to have follow'd his own *Ideas*, than any uniform Rule, for altho he professeth to adhere to the *Greek Text* in his Interpretation of the New Testament; nevertheless he often departs from it, preferring the antient *Latin Edition*; there are also some places where he hath regard neither to the *Greek*, not yet to the *Latin* of the *Vulgar*.

It is to be admir'd that *Saubertus* who is expert in Critical Disquisitions, and hath acknowledg'd all these imperfections in *Luther's Bible*, (e) should commend it as an excellent Version, and should impute these defects to the diversity of the Copies, as if this Doctor were allow'd to have no certain Text whereon to fix; not that I am of opinion that the ordinary *Greek* ought of necessity to be follow'd; since I have already shewn the contrary: neither can I blame him for not entirely adhering thereto, but because he hath been guided rather by his own Fancy, in the choice that he hath sometimes made of the *Latin Edition*, than by the exact Rules of the Critical Art.

If his Translation (say they) be not always conformable to the Printed *Greek Text*, it agrees in several places with the various Readings which have been since describ'd in the Margent of the Copies, as if he were able to guess at the different Readings that were afterward discover'd by the help of certain MSS. There was extant when he wrote his Version, but a very small number of *Greek Editions* of the New Testament, viz. That of Cardinal *Ximenes* in his large Bible of *Alcala*, that of *Erasmus*, that of *Aldus*, and few others; At least, unless he were reputed to have had recourse to some Manuscripts which he never saw, he could only consult those Editions, wherein he must of necessity have been limited, since he transcrib'd from the *Greek*. *s. sub. ibid.*

(e) *Beatus Lutherus in optimâ versione sua, quam exquisitissimo studio & incredulâ industria paravit, non sexcentam lectionem, sed marginalem, quæ quidem hodie nobis tales sunt, aliquando exprimat.* Joann. Saub. Proleg. var. lect. S. Matth.

That which hath caus'd his Translation to be frequently consonant to the *Greek* MSS. that were unknown to him, is, that he hath abandon'd the *Greek* Text in the most part of those places, to follow the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, who had other Copies different from the ordinary *Greek*. As for Example, in the 2. Epistle of St. Peter, Chap. 2. vers. 13. where the word *ἀνδρῶν* is read in all the *Greek* Copies, excepting the *Alexandrian*, and one of *Rome*, in which we find *ἀγίων*, he hath adher'd to this later reading conformably to the *Vulgar*. This is sufficient to oblige Mr. *Saubert* to declare, that *Luther* hath applied himself with greater diligence and circumspection than is imagin'd by his adversaries, to the Translating of the Sacred Books. *B. Lutherus majori quàm adversarii credant diligentia Sacrarum Literarum interpretationem est aggressus.* He determin'd without doubt that there was extant a certain *Greek* Copy like unto that of *Alexandria*, the reading whereof was approv'd by this Doctor in that particular passage.

Saub. ibid.
p. 36.

But it is much more probable that *Luther* never saw this sort of MSS. having had regard only to the ancient *Latin* Version, which he thought fit to prefer in those places, before his *Greek* Copies that did not seem to him therein to contain so clear a sense; However he is not always successful in his choice, since there are some passages where he hath unadvisedly esteem'd the ordinary *Greek* Text as more authentick than the *Latin* of the *Vulgar*, which nevertheless is more exact. Moreover he hath express'd in his Translation in Chap. 6. of St. *Matthew*, vers. 13. these words *ὅτι αὐτῶν ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ δόξα, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* for *thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever*, which are a manifest Gloss, and were not read by the ancient *Latin* Interpreter in his Original. It is merely the effect of obstinacy, that the *Lutherans*, and among others *Abrahamus Calovius*, maintain that they belong to the Text of St. *Matthew's* Gospel.

Calov. Annot. ad c. 6.
Mat. v. 13.

However, it must be confess'd, that the Writers of Controversies both *Roman Catholics* and *Calvinists* have not always done justice to *Luther* as often as they accuse him for corrupting the Books of the New Testament. They have objected to him for instance, on either hand, that he hath omitted in his Version the 7th Verse in Chap. 3. of the 1. Epistle of St. *John*, wherein mention is made of the Testimony of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost. They have likewise reprov'd him as having favour'd the *Arian* Heresy in retrenching these words which apparently confirm the Mystery of the Holy Trinity. But forasmuch as he Compos'd his Translation from the *Greek* Original, and in regard that this passage was not compris'd in the most part of the *Greek* Copies that were extant in his time, he ought not to be condemn'd on this account. He had not read it in the two first Editions of *Erasmus*, nor in that of *Aldus*, nor even in some of those of *Germany*; it is true that it was included in that of *Spain*, which he should have mention'd in his remarks. His followers have here abandon'd him, having inserted this Verse in the later

later Editions of their High Dutch Bible; nay they even vehemently assert that it certainly appertains to the Text of St. John.

Moreover, it was represented to Luther on behalf of the Roman Catholics, that he hath not express'd these words in his Translation *per bona opera*, which are comprehended in the Vulgar in Chap. 1. vers. 10. of the 2. Epistle of St. Peter, and are likewise read in some Greek Copies. But this objection does not appear to be well grounded, in regard that there was not then extant any Greek Edition of the New Testament wherein they were contain'd; Nevertheless *Raitbius* is deceiv'd when he maintains that the Manuscripts in which it is written, *ὅτι τῶν καλῶν ἔργων*, by good Works, are modern; on the contrary, they are the most ancient of all that we now have in our possession, and there is no reason to doubt that the Interpreter of the Church made use of a Greek Original of the like nature. If *Calovius* had never so little reflected on the antiquity of these MSS. he would not have so peremptorily affirm'd, that the Greek Copies in which we find these words are of no authority, as being of a later date, and alter'd conformably to the reading of the Vulgar, *Ille per bona opera, alienus est, quia non habetur in textu authentico, exceptis paucis codicibus isque recentioribus, in quos ex Vulgatâ Versione irrepsit.* *Raitb. Vind. p. 26.* *Calov. Annot. ad 2 Pet. c. 1. vers. 10.*

Furthermore these two passages are of sufficient importance to demonstrate to every one, that there are certain various readings in the Greek Text of the New Testament, which well deserve to be consider'd, and that the Versions made by the Protestants from the ordinary Greek, without taking any notice of them in the Margent, are not very exact: However, this omission is shore excusable in Luther than in his followers, because the same discoveries were not apparent in his time, as have been since made with respect to these variations.

There is also another considerable defect in the Interpretation of this famous Doctor, which is common to him, with many of the modern Translators, especially among the Protestants. He hath too much limited in some places the words of his Text, specifying that which is only express'd in general terms. Now these restrictions are more dangerous in a Version of the Holy Scriptures, wherein as far as is possible the pure word of God ought to be exhibited, than in all other Translations, I say, as far as is possible, because it is extremely difficult if not altogether impossible for an Interpreter to retain in his Translation every thing that is written in the Original. *Flacius Illyricus* a Divine of great repute among the Lutheran party, hath made no scruple to aver (f) that there never was hitherto extant any Version of the Bible, in which no Errors were contain'd, and that it was not possible to compose one that should be absolutely exempt from all faults, tho' even an Angel should undertake this

(f) Verissimum sane est nullam Sacrorum Codicum versionem prorsus vel jam factam esse, vti deinceps fieri posse, etiamsi ab aliquo Angelo tentaretur, in qua plane nullus sit lapsus. *Illyr. Clav. Script. Sac. part. 2. tract. 6.*

Work. On this account it is the property of a judicious Translator to approach as near as he can to the very Letter of his Original : On the contrary, *Luther* seems to have had no other design than to introduce the Holy Ghost, speaking according to the propriety of the *German* Tongue. His Disciples affirm, that his Translation is written in so pure a style, that *Franciscus Dryander* a *Spaniard* by Nation, was very desirous to attain to the knowledge of that Language, only that he might be able to read the aforesaid Bible : This *Dryander* is the same person with the above-mention'd *Franciscus Enzinas* who was the Author of a *Spanish* Version of the New Testament.

M. Luther's Translation of the New Testament no sooner appear'd, but *Emserus* publish'd another in High *Dutch* with Annotations in which he censures the former in a great number of places : But perhaps he would have acted more prudently in abbreviating his Criticisms, and in rendering his Interpretation more accurately ; *Dietsbergenius* not long after set forth an entire Version of the Bible to oppose that of *Luther*. If these Translations produc'd a good effect with reference to the *Roman* Catholicks, on the other hand they were despised by the *Lutherans*, when they perceiv'd them to be written in a rude and unintelligible style, for the same reason they derided that of the *Zwinglians*, which was proper (as they said) for the use of none but *Switzers* ; Nevertheless this last is more exact than the *Lutheran*. But the common People, and even the most part of men, who are not capable of judging whether a Version be conformable to the Original or not, usually prefer those that are most polite, with respect to the Elegancy of the Expressions, and which seem to them to be more intelligible than others.

This chiefly gave occasion to that great reputation which accr'd to *Luther's* Bible throughout all *Germany*. The *Calvinists* of *Neustadt*, of *Herborne*, and some other places, (as I have elsewhere observ'd) caus'd it to be Reprinted for their use ; but having revis'd and alter'd it according to their own prejudicate Notions, especially in the Prefaces and Summaries ; the *Lutherans* fail'd not sharply to reprove them, as having corrupted their Masters Version, and infected it with their false Doctrine.

Waltb. Offic. Bibl. Sect. 457. *Dum novae subinde versiones prae necessitate cudent (says Waltherus) versionem Lutheri falsant glossisque pestilentissimis depravant.* The same Author objects likewise to the *Calvinists* of *Neustadt*, who set forth in the year 1588. a new Edition of *Luther's* Version, together with certain Summaries in the Margent conformable to their Maxims, that they had no other design, than by this means to propagate *Zwinglianism* and *Calvinism* : *Toxicum suum Zuinglio-Calvinianum incantis instillare astute conati sunt.* *Jacobus Andreas* one of the Chief of the *Lutheran* Party wrote against this new Edition of *Luther's* Bible, to discover the imperfections thereof.

Waltherus hath likewise decried the Edition of the same Bible published by the *Calvinists* of *Herborn* A.D. 1595, from that which was Printed at *Francfort* : He accuseth them for taking away the Prefaces, and inserting

inserting others in their room, because they perceiv'd that their Errors were therein effectually confuted: *quod scirent errores suos crebrò in iis debito zelo & severitate taxari.* This *Lutheran* Doctor was so Zealous for the credit of his Master's Translation (g) that he could not endure that the Publishers thereof should retrench any thing whatsoever, tho' it were of never so little moment. He likewise exhorts Princes, Magistrates, Cities and Academies to punish these wicked offenders: In a word, the *Lutherans* have a greater veneration for their *High Dutch* Version, than the *Roman* Catholicks have for that of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter. Their Divines esteem (b) it as a special favour which *Germany* hath receiv'd from Heaven, by reason that it faithfully expresseth (according to their Opinion) the genuine sense of the Originals, as being written in a pure and Elegant style, and after such a manner as is intelligible to the whole World; as also in regard that it supplies the place of a Paraphrase and Commentary in the most difficult passages.

But the misfortune is, that their Bible is so exceedingly valued by none but *Lutherans*. The alterations that they have been oblig'd to make in some Editions, are an evident proof that it is not exact, and that *Luther* in Composing his Version hath not followed those rules that ought of necessity to be observ'd by a faithful Interpreter. The *High Dutch* Translation of the *Zwinglians* of *Zurich* is more accurate; because they were more skilful in the knowledge of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Tongues than *Luther*; they have also taken less liberty in their method of Translating.

Moreover, *Joannes Piscator*, a *Calvinist*, Publish'd in the year 1604. an entire Version of the whole Bible in the *German* Tongue; which (if we may give credit to the report of the *Lutherans*) is full of Errors and Blasphemies, *blasphemii & erroribus scatet infinitis* judice *Menzero*: They call Errors and Blasphemies the particular sentiments of the *Calvinists*, which are opposite to the Confession of *Ausbourg*. They likewise condemn this Version as being written in obsolete *High-Dutch*; and in regard that *Piscator* speaks rather the barbarous Language of the *Vandals*, than the pure *German*, *Vandalicè potius quàm Germanicè loquitur.*

(g) Non desunt qui sacrilegio nefario ex suis editionibus penitus auferunt glossas marginali m rginales, quas summi thesauri & sepe commentarii loco habent omnes corditi Philodénesi, quod Principes, Academiæ, civitates & Magistratus orthodoxi permittere non deberent, sed potius graviter animadvertere in ejusmodi vultures & harpiyas. *Walth. Offic. Bibl. Sect. 452.*

(b) Ecclesiæ & Theologi nostri agnoscunt & deprædicant toto pectore labiisque laudisonis insigne beneficium quod Germanis nobis per Germanicam Lutheri versionem Deus præstitit, & uno ore fatentur omnes illam textus originalis sententiam fidelissimè exprimere, sermone constare perspicuo, puritatem linguæ tueri, & in locis difficilioribus paraphraseos & commentarii operam præstare. *Id. ibid. Sect. 454.*

In fine, the *Lutherans* take delight in decrying all the *High Dutch* Bibles that have been Printed by the *Calvinists*. *Tossenus*, who set forth *Luther's* Translation in the year 1617. altering some passages therein, especially with respect to the Notes, is (as they say) in regard guilty of Impiety that he hath chang'd the Glosses of this Version to substitute others abounding with errors in their room, especially in that which relates to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of our Lord; as also to Election and the Person of Jesus Christ, nay, they sometimes charge him with corrupting the Text of the Holy Scriptures. Thus those Protestants having once abandon'd the antient Interpreter of the Western Churches, have had no certain rule for their Translations, as may be inferr'd from the Accusations which they bring one against another, some whereof are not alledg'd without a sufficient cause.

Raith. Vind. Vers. Luth. ch. 7. It is true indeed, that the *Lutherans* do not pretend that this *High-Dutch* Translation is of equal Authority with the Originals of the Sacred Writings, since some of them have taken the liberty to correct it in several places. This is one of their Answers to those who object that it is not accurate. *Præstamus autem, faith Raithius, ad leniendam adversariorum ejus invidiam, versionem B. Lutheri apud nos nunquam & nusquam fuisse authenticam. Unde & à nostratibus quandoque corrigitur.* This *Lutheran* Writer acknowledges the difference that there is between the Spring and the Streams that flow from thence: *novimus discrimen inter fontes & rivus.* He does not believe that it is requisite that a Version of the Holy Scriptures should be so exact as perfectly to represent its Original, it is sufficient that it doth not err in matters appertaining to Faith and good Manners.

There is nothing in this assertion but what is judicious, and may be readily granted, I shall likewise concur with him in that which he adds in the same place, viz. (i) that the Church hath, during many Ages, made use of Translations of the Bible, which were not free from defects; nevertheless, she hath extracted from them the fundamental Articles of Faith, and every thing that is necessary unto Salvation. This being admitted, were it not more expedient to retain the publick use of these so antient Versions, adding at the same time a few Illustrations in the form of Notes, to explain the Grammatical Sense, than to Compose any new, which have introduc'd disorder, and even scandal among the Protestants? They accuse one another on this occasion of no less crimes than *Blasphemy* and *Herésie*. Wherefore I would intreat them to consider, whether the *Roman* Catholicks have not acted more prudently in adhering to the *Latin* Interpreter of the Western Churches, whose Version is far more

(i) *Ecclesia tot seculis usa est versionibus erroribus obnoxia. Nihilofecius fundamenta inde hausit necessaria creditu, factu & speratu, in quibus ne decipiatur cavit divina providentia.* Raith. Vind. Vers. Luth. th. 7.

antient than all the Disputes concerning Religion, that have been the cause of our separation from them.

The *Calvinists* of *Germany*, who held at first nothing more exact to present to their Party, than *Luther's* Translation, as defective as it was, have in these later times surrogated another in its place. They have caus'd to be Printed at *Francfort, Ann. Dom.* 1668. a new *High Dutch* Version, which was taken from the last Edition of the *Flemish* Bible; and was approv'd by the Doctors of the Faculty of Divinity at *Heidelberg*.

It were needless for me to insist at large on the Translations of the Sacred Books in the *Dutch* Language, since I have elsewhere discours'd concerning them. It is well known to the whole World, that the Protestants of the *Low Countries* have had two different Versions of the *H. Scriptures*; forasmuch as they wanted in the beginning of their Reformation, persons who were capable of Translating them from the Originals; and besides, in regard that they were averse (as all the other Protestants) from that of the antient *Latin* Interpreter, they chose rather to render into their peculiar Dialect, the *German* Translation of *M. Luther*, than to follow the *Vulgar*: But afterward many of them who were more expert in the knowledge of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Tongues, than their Primitive Reformers began to be asham'd any longer to make use of a Version so much abounding with errors: whereupon they Compos'd a new one according to the Decree of their Synod of *Dort*, which nevertheless appear'd not until the year 1638.

Crit. Hist. of the Old Test. Book. 2. c. 23. Tract. of Insp. p. 11.

In the mean time *Sixtinus Amama* a Professor of the *Hebrew* Tongue at *Francker*, publish'd a Book written in *Dutch*, wherein he shewed by a great number of examples, the necessity that there was at that time of furnishing their Churches with a new Translation of the Bible. He dedicates his Work to the States-General, to Prince *Maurice* and the Council of State, representing to them that their Common-wealth which was rais'd from small beginnings to a very great height of Power, had not as yet arriv'd to such a degree of Happiness, as to enjoy an accurate Version of the *H. Scriptures* in their Mother Tongue. He thereupon cites *Marnix* of *St. Aldegonde*, who had openly Declar'd that of all the Translations of the Protestants, none was so remote from the Original as the Sermon of *Martin Luther*, from whence their *Flemish* Bible was taken. It is not to be admir'd (continues *Amama*) that *Luther*, who was involv'd in so great a multiplicity of Business, and was chiefly employ'd in Preaching, hath not obtain'd good success in this undertaking; Moreover, he affirms that the *Dutch* Translation was contrary in some places to the intention of the Holy Ghost. On this account the *Calvinists* of the *Low Countries* liv'd a long time without having in their possession the word of God in its Original Purity; there were then wanting able Interpreters, sufficiently skill'd in the Grammatical Art, to rectifie the error of their Bible, and to render it compleat.

Sixti Amam. Bib. Con- fer. Amst. 1623.

In 1627.

Gomar, a famous Doctor of the Calvinist party, agrees to all this in a Latin Epistle, written from Groningen to Amama. *Nostra Biblia* (says he) *non ex Hebræa Scaturigine, sed ex Germanico Lutheri rivo pro Ecclesiæ nostræ laborantis & afflictæ necessitate raptim sunt transfusi.* He would persuade us nevertheless to believe (k) that we are oblig'd to *Luther*, for having, as it were, first broken the Ice, and *diligently purg'd* the reading of the Sacred Text from many errors, which (according to his opinion) are found in the Bibles of the Church of *Rome*. Thus the Protestant Divines, even those of great Repute among them, condemn the ancient Interpreter of the Western Churches, merely through obstinacy.

Amama receiv'd likewise at the same time another Letter to the like effect from the Ministers of *Leuwarden*, wherein they approv'd his Work (l) not doubting but that a Version of the Bible in *Dutch* would be very useful and acceptable to their Churches, especially to the Pastors. Those Ministers had reason to speak after this manner; for the greater part of them not understanding the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Tongues, were well pleas'd in being furnish'd with a Translation, whereto they might attribute the name of an Original.

The Protestants of the *Arminian* Sect residing in the *Low Countries*, could scarcely be persuaded to admit this second Version of the *Flemish* Bible, which they believ'd to be the Work of a particular Faction or Cabal. *Episcopus*, who was one of the chief of that party, accuseth the Authors of this new Translation, as having express'd their own private Opinions, rather than the propriety of the words and phrases of the Sacred Text. He declares moreover, that they had no other design in adding Notes thereto, than to shew that there was nothing written in the H. Scriptures, but what agreed with the Doctrine of the Calvinists, after the same manner as it was establish'd in the Synod of *Dort*: *Ut Dordracena fides & universa Calvini Theologia quasi sanciretur, & animis legentium insinuaretur.*

Epist. lib. 4.
Institut.
Theol. c. 21.

However, I am inform'd that those *Arminians* read no other *Dutch* Translation in their Assemblies, than that of the Calvinists, there being none among them that hath hitherto undertaken to Interpret the whole Bible; We find only the New Testament Translated out of *Greek* into *Flemish*, by one of the Ministers of the *Arminian* Church at *Rotterdam*; this Version was Printed, together with short Notes at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1680; but it doth not appear that it was very much esteem'd, even

(k) *Luthero eximio Christi seruo maxime debentur gratia, quod primus quasi glaciem perforaverit, & Sacri Codicis lectionem e sacra lingua à tam multis Pontificiorum corruptelis repurgarit.* Gomar. Epist. ad Sixt. Amam.

(l) *Non dubitantes quin opus hoc in Ecclesiâ Belgicâ, in primis earum Pastoribus, gratum sit & utile.* Epist. Ministr. Leuward, ad Sixt. Amam.

by that Party. The Author declares in his Preface, that he did not offer his Work to be examin'd by those of his Society, but only to the perusal of certain persons of great Note, and of some other Learned Men.

There is likewise extant a Translation of the New Testament in the German Tongue, attributed to the *Socinians*, which hath been decried by some Authors, as not being very exact. I know not whether it be that whereof *Christophorus Sandys* makes mention in his Catalogue of the Writers of that Sect, in which he (m) imputes to *Johannes Crellius* an High Dutch Version of the New Testament, jointly with *Joachimus Stegmannus*.

The *Mennonites* or *Anabaptists* of the Low Countries have also in their possession, an entire Translation of the Bible in *Flemish*, which was taken from the German of *M. Luther*; there are two different Editions thereof, in which they have revis'd their former Version. But in regard that there were no persons among those Sectaries, who had acquir'd a sufficient knowledge of the Oriental Languages, and the Critical Art, their Corrections are absurd. We may have recourse to that which hath been always related concerning them in my Treatise of the Inspiration of the Sacred Books.

Lastly, the *Roman* Catholics have caused to be Printed with Privilege, in the last Age, divers *Flemish* Bibles. *Nicholas Van Winghe*, who hath set forth one in this Language, declares in his Preface bearing Date *Anno Dom. 1548.* that he made use of a Dutch Translation Printed in *Holland* Seventy years ago; and consequently before the appearing of the Protestants, and that he had likewise consulted the German Versions of *Eckius* and *Dietenbergius*. He adds, that he was assisted by *Petrus Cortensis* Rector of the University of *Louvain*, and by another Professor of Divinity of the same Faculty.

This Translator informs us in the above-cited Preface, that the Emperor *Charles V.* revok'd in the year 1546. the Licenses that he had given out Twenty years ago for the publishing of several Translations in the Vulgar Tongue; that he generally prohibited all the *Walloon* and *Flemish* Bible, which had been Printed in *Brabant* since that time, by reason that they were remote from the ancient *Latin* Edition; And Lastly, that this Prince then Granted unto *Bartholomew Van Grave*, Printer to the University of *Louvain*, a Privilege for the setting forth of *Latin*, *Walloon* and *Flemish* Bibles, after they were corrected and approv'd by certain Doctors of the aforesaid University, whom he should think fit to depute for this purpose.

Nic. Van Winghe, Pref. to his *Flemish* Vers.

(m) *Novum Testamentum in Germanicum versum adjuvante Joachimo Stegmanno seniore Racoviae Anno 1630. Sand. Biblioth. Antitrinit. advoc. Joann. Crell. p. 116.*

Van Wingbe acknowledgeth in the same place, that these Translations in the Vulgar Tongue were disallow'd by many, who could not endure that the Holy Scriptures should be deliver'd into the possession of the Ignorant People, that were not capable of understanding those Sacred Oracles, and even oftentimes perverted them. But what is there (says he) that may not be abus'd by the presumptuous? Therefore after having consider'd that there were already extant other *Flemish* Bibles; which tho' not very exact, were read by the People, he thought it convenient to publish a more accurate Version of all the Sacred Books in the same Language, to the end that these falsify'd Bibles might be taken out of their hands.

C H A P. XLIV.

Of the other Versions of the Northern People, particularly of the Polish and some others. The Conclusion of this Work. Certain new Reflections on the Translations of the Holy Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue. A Resolution of this Question, whether the reading of them ought to be permitted indifferently to all sorts of Persons?

THE Northern People, who prefer'd the innovations of *M. Luther* before their ancient Religion, have all Translated his *German* Bible into their own peculiar Language? We are inform'd that one of his Disciples deliver'd to the *Suedes* their first Translation. *Suecicam versionem* (says *Pseifferus*) fecit *M. Laurentius Petri Archiepiscopus Upsaliensis discipulus B. Lutheri.* (a) The *Danes* in like manner had a Version of all the Sacred Writings in their Tongue, *A. D.* 1524. which they afterward revis'd to render it more conformable to the Original. Moreover, there is extant a Translation of the Bible in the *Islandish*, which is affirm'd to be ancient *Norwegian* or *Gothick* Language, as also one in that of *Finland*, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, which was Printed in the Year 1648. The *Laplanders* have likewise the *Psalter* and some other portions of the Bible in the proper dialect of their Country.

They that desire a more particular account of the Versions of those People who inhabit the most remote parts of the North, need only to consult a Treatise written by *Christianus Kortholrus* a *Lutheran* Doctor of the *Dutchy of Holstein* Entitled, *De variis Bibliorum Editionibus.* This Northern Divine hath Compos'd another little Tract concerning the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue; wherein he observes that the *Finlanders*, and the Inhabitants of *Lapland*, celebrate Divine Service

(a) *Danica versio prima est M. Michaelis edita Lipsiæ anno 1524. at recentior auspiciis Christiani IV. edita nulli facile versionum cedit.* Aug. Pfeiff. Crit. Sac. c. 13.

in the *Suedish* Language, which is not spoken among them, but he avers at the same time, that it was understood by the greatest part of those Nations. He likewise makes mention of some other People (b) of the Dutchy of *Sleswick*, who read the High *Dutch* Bible in their Congregations, and recite their publick Prayers in the same Tongue, which is very different from the proper dialect of that Jurisdiction. Moreover, he describes divers other places where the *Danish* Language is spoken; and nevertheless all the Ecclesiastical Offices are written in the Old *German*, which is not the *Vulgar* Tongue of those Countrys.

The *Socinians*, who at first settled themselves in *Poland* have set forth several Translations of the Sacred Books in the Language of that Kingdom, and many of them were associated together in the Composing of the *Polish* Bible, which *Nicholas Radzevil* Palatine of *Vilna* caus'd to be Printed in the year 1563. *Simon de Budni*, who obtain'd a very great repute among that Party, and was depos'd from his Ministry by his Brethren for maintaining divers particular Opinions, is the Author of a *Polish* Version of the whole Bible taken from the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Originals: This Translation which was publish'd in *Lituania*, A. D. 1572. is honourably cited as to the Old Testament by certain *Jews*. *Sandius* likewise attributes a Version of the New Testament in this Tongue, Printed with Annotations A. D. 1577. to *Martinus Coechevius*, who had embrac'd the Doctrine of *Socinus* in the year 1570.

Sand. Biblioth. Antierit. p. 51.

Forasmuch as the design of the *Socinians* in publishing these *Polish* Versions, was to propagate their Errors throughout the whole Kingdom of *Poland*, (c) *Jacobus Viocius* a Jesuit of that Country, by the order of Pope *Gregory XIII.* Compos'd a Translation of all the Sacred Books in this Language, to be oppos'd to that of the *Anti-Trinitarians*. It was taken from the ancient *Latin* Edition, and afterwards Printed at *Cracovia*, A. D. 1599.

(b) In ditione Sico. censi loca reperiuntur v. g. insula Silta, Fera, Alrama, quorum indigenis vernacula est in hunc usque diem veterum Frisiorum septentrionalium lingua ab idiomate Germanico adeo discrepans, ut nec ipsismet Holsatis aliis vel obscure intelligatur. — Nihil tamen secius iis in locis sola Germanica lingua, quam partim in scholis, partim ex conversatione cum vicinis addiscunt incolae, publicae Scripturarum lectiones frequentantur, solennes ad Deum preces funduntur, hymni canuntur, conciones ad populum habentur, & omnia sacra peraguntur. Simili Germanici idiomatis in conventibus Ecclesiae usus in nonnullis Cimbricæ nostrae locis, ubi Danica lingua vernacula hodie obtinuit. Germanicam vero linguam dum hic nomino, dialectum intelligo Germaniae superioris, cujus nempe usus non tantum apud Holsatos nostros, sed & Meklenburgicos, Pomeranos vicinosque populos alios adeo hodie invaluit, ut dum res divina peragitur, ipsi sola audiantur, posthabita dialect. vernaculâ. Korth. de lect. Bibl. ling. vulgo cogn. comm. edit. Kiloni ann. 1670.

(c) *Jacobus Viocius Vangrovensis* Polonus Theologus Societatis Jesu — *Vetus ac Novum Testamentum* è *Vulgatâ Latinâ Editione Polonicâ* fecit, mandante *Gregorio XIII.* & approbante *Clemente VIII.* Pontifice Maximo, quæ *Cracoviae* fuerunt excusa, & ea quidem versio fuit perutilis & necessaria restringendis eorum erroribus; qui ex falsa novorum *Arianorum* & aliorum hæreticorum versione passim serpebant. Edita vero est apud *Lazarum Cracoviae* anno 1599. Possev. in Appar. ad voc. *Jacob. Vio.*

with

with the approbation of *Clement VIII.* *Possevinus* assures us, that this new *Polish* Bible was very opportunely set forth to abolish the Erroneous Principles of the modern *Arians*, which were every where dispers'd in these Territories. The same Jesuit wrote in his own Tongue divers political Works against the *Socinians*, and distributed into the hands of the People (d) certain *Postilles* on the Gospels, that are read in the Churches throughout the whole Year, which have been since Translated into the *Bohemian* Language, and wherein he hath inserted some things relating to Controversial matters.

I can give no particular account of divers other Versions of the Bible which have been Printed in the *Bohemian, Hungarian, and Sclavonian* Languages, and in those of some other Nations; excepting that *St. Jerom* never Translated the Holy Scriptures into the *Sclavonian*, as many Authors have affirm'd, especially among the Protestants, who were desirous to authorize their Translations in the Vulgar Tongue by the example of this great man. *The Jesuitical Spirit* (says *Benedictus Turretinus*) may be discover'd here, in that *Grestes* takes delight in denying that *St. Jerom* ever Interpreted the Bible in the *Sclavonian Tongue*, and *St. Chrysostom* the New Testament in the *Armenian*, altho' it is aver'd by *Sixtus Sinenses* on the Testimony of divers Ecclesiastical Authors. If the aforesaid Minister of *Geneva* had diligently examin'd this matter of fact, he would have found that these two Versions attributed to *St. Jerom* and *St. Chrysostom*, are really imaginary, and that when the former declar'd that he had Translated the Bible, for the use of those that spoke his Language; he meant the *Latin*, as may be easily prov'd by many passages of his Works, where the very same expression is us'd in this sense.

Ben. Turret,
Vind. of the
Vers. of Gen.
against F.
Coton.

Furthermore, the Protestants do in vain oppose to the Custom of the Western Churches, who read the H. Scripture and other parts of the Offices in *Latin* in their Assemblies, the contrary practice of the Primitive Ages. The aforesaid ancient Custom is not denied by them, and they will even find in this Work a greater number of Translations in the Vulgar Tongue, made by the *Roman Catholics*, than hath been hitherto exhibited; but they will perceive at the same time, that the Church of *Rome* hath not introduc'd any Innovation when she retains in the publick Service the ancient *Latin* Edition, having therein acted conformably to the practice of the most famous Eastern Churches, as hath been demonstrated even beyond contradiction.

The Primitive Fathers had reason to exhort the Faithful of their time to the reading of the Sacred Books; because the Holy Scriptures were really given for the Instruction of the whole Word. The Traditions

(d) *Postillam item Polonicam duplicem, unam uberiolem, alteram breviorcm, super Evangelia totius anni, quibus tum peccata, tum hæresis, quæ peccatorum est pœna, accuratissime refellatur. Postillam autem hanc Bohemicè Andreas Modestinus noster edi curavit. Poss. ibid.*

receiv'd in the Church, were then reverenc'd, and the People were subject to the direction of their Bishops and Pastors, who caus'd them to understand the Word of God: But since some Seditious Spirits have abus'd this reading to bring in Innovations into Religion, it was necessary to use some precaution in this matter, and not to allow it indifferently to all sorts of Persons.

It is with respect thereto, that we ought to judge concerning the Sentiments of some Popes, of divers Councils of *France*, and of some Learned Doctors who have disapprov'd the Translations of the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue. They had regard to the disorders that were thereby caus'd both in the Church and State; neither can we on this account censure the proceedings of the Faculty of Divinity at *Paris*, which hath generally condemn'd all the Versions of the Holy Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue, whether they were Compos'd by Protestants or Catholics. This Prohibition was then necessary, by reason that those Bibles were more prejudicial to private Persons, than useful for their Instruction.

However, I would not extend such an Inhibition to all times and to all sorts of People. If they are permitted even at this day in *France*, *Germany*, *Flanders*, and some other places, it is in regard that they are not believ'd to be so dangerous as they were in the last Age. The Example of some Popes is herein follow'd, who thought it Expedient that the Bible should be deliver'd to the People Translated into their Language, provided that these Translations were Compos'd from the Vulgar by *Roman* Catholick Authors, and by this means the Versions of the Hereticks were taken out of their hands.

It is true indeed that the Disputes concerning matters of Religion are not so pernicious as they were at the first appearing of Heresies; but after all, the danger does not altogether cease; the same reasons that they had heretofore to distrust the Translations of the Protestants subsist at present. Father *Veron* who hath maintain'd with a great deal of earnestness, That the Bible ought to be exhibited to the People render'd into their Mother-Tongue by Catholick Interpreters, advileth the Ignorant and the Weak in Faith, to follow therein the direction of their Superiors.

It is of very little moment to be inform'd, that the Rule of the *Index Expurgatorius*, which forbids private Persons to read the Holy Scriptures in their own Language, without having first obtain'd a License to this purpose, is not admitted in *France*: It is sufficient to know that the Divines who Compos'd this Rule, assure us, that they did not make their Prohibition (e) until after having found by Experience that the Bibles in the Vulgar Tongue being put into the hands of all People, usually brought more detriment than advantage to the affairs of Religion. The Reasons of these Reverend Divines ought to be weigh'd, without

(e) Experimento manifestum si Sacra Biblia vulgari lingua permittantur, plus inde ob hominum temeritatem detrimenti quam utilitatis oriri. Ind. Reg. 4.

being very solicitous, to enquire whether their Rule were allow'd in France or not.

Grosius, who was persuaded that the Sacred Books were written for the use of the whole World, avoucheth nevertheless (f) that the Versions which have been made of them are dangerous, and that even *Rivetus* his Adversary, who was a Zealous Calvinist, could not deny it. He adds likewise, that *Luther* hath acknowledg'd that the great number of Translations of the Holy Scriptures render'd the Readers of them uncertain; and that *Beza* wish'd that the course of these Versions were stop'd, by reason that the sense of the Text was corrupted by so many Interpreters. This Learned Man approves the Conduct of those who having the Government of the Churches committed to their Charge, endeavour to prevent this mischief; which cannot be done (says he) but by substituting accurate Translations in the room of those that are suspected; and he also affirms, that this Work was promoted in France even in his time.

He apparently intended to make mention of Cardinal *Richelieu*, who had oblig'd certain Doctors to undertake the Translating of the Bible into the French Tongue, but this Design was not accomplish'd; nevertheless I am apt to believe that *Grosius* was mistaken (g) when he wrote in one of his Epistles directed to *Gerardus Vossius*, that the *Psalms* were sung in French in some of the Churches of Paris; since there is a great deal of difference between delivering to the People a Version of the H. Scriptures in their own Language, for their private Instruction, and reading it publicly in the Service of the Church; the former practice may be authoris'd without establishing the later.

Forasmuch as this wise Cardinal applied himself with a great deal of Care and Prudence to the reconciling of the Protestants of France to the Church of Rome, he determin'd that it was requisite to take away that which might offend them; now it is certain, that they could not endure that the People should be forbidden to read the Sacred Writings in their peculiar Language; wherefore it was necessary to remove this obstacle, which was the principal reason that induc'd him to insist so earnestly on a new Version of the Bible in French, notwithstanding the opposition of the Faculty of Theology at Paris. He undoubtedly had regard to the example of some Popes, who have even in our time approv'd this sort

(f) In versionibus esse periculum neo D. Rivetus negat. Lutherus dixit per tot versiones incertiores fieri lectores quam antea fuerant; Beza vero tot esse interpretes qui non tam convertunt quam pervertunt, ut, nisi audacia eorum occurratur, futurum sit intra paucos annos, ut ipsarum quoque rerum possessione depellamur. Non mirum ergo si ei periculi occursum volumus Ecclesie praefides, quod optime fiet, si ei fides versiones subsistant; quae cura nunc in Gallia suscipitur. Grot. Rivet. Apolog. discuss. p. 728.

(g) Vertuntur Biblia Regis jussu in sermonem Gallicum ad usum populi. In Ecclesiis nonnullis hujus urbis Psalmi, Oratio Dominica, Symbolum, Decalogus canuntur Gallice. Grot. Epist. ad Ger. Voss. ann. 1641.

of Translations in the Vulgar Tongue: The discretion of these Popes, and of the most able Divines of the Church of *Rome*, appears herein, that they would not allow that any other Versions should be read by the People, than those that were taken from the ancient *Latin* Edition: And indeed, what can be the use of such as are Compos'd from the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Originals on this occasion, since they had no other design than to cause the ignorant People to understand that which is recited or sung publicly in the Churches? Moreover, we cannot Publish any Translations that are more free from all manner of prejudicate Notions, than those that exactly follow the Vulgar, which is the most ancient, and was written long before all the Western Schisms. *Tutissima omnium* (says *Grot. Vol. Grotius*) *is qui nec Hebraicè nec Gracè didicere, est Vulgata Versio, qua nul-* *pro pace Ec-*
lum habet malum dogma, sicut tot seculorum & gentium consensus judicavit. *claf. p. 674.*

F I N I S.

THE
Critical History
OF THE
VERSIONS
OF THE
New Testament.

PART II.

By Father SIMON *of the* Oratory.

TOGETHER

With a Refutation of such Passages as seem Contrary to the
Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *ENGLAND*.

Licensed, November 22. 1689.

J. FRASER.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Tho. Newborough* at the Golden Ball, and *Tho. Bennet*
at the Half-Moon in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, 1692.

read them in one of his *Greek* Manuscripts which apparently belonged to the number of those ancient Copies in which several Gospels were confounded together, for these same words are in *St. Luke*, Chap. 6. v 37. In the 24th verse of the same Chapter, where it is in the ordinary *Greek* *ὁμοιωσω*, *I will liken*, the *Syriac* hath read with our *Latin* Interpreter, *ὁμοιωθήσεαι*, *shall be likened*, as it is also in an ancient *Greek* Manuscript cited by *Beza*. In the 29th verse, we read in the *Syriac* aswell as in our *Vulgar*, *eorum & Pharisei*, which confirms the *Greek* reading of the *Marquess de Velec*, which nevertheless is not found in any other *Greek* Manuscript.

In the 8th Chapter, verse 5. instead of *ἐκ τὸν ὡρχο*, we find in the *Syriac*, as in our *Vulgar*, the *Latin* word *Centurio*. In the 14th verse of the same Chapter, the word *Simon's* is put in the room of *Πέτρος*, *Peter's*, which is in the *Greek*. In the 24th verse, the *Syrian* Translator hath added *Jesus* after the particle *καὶ*. In the 28th verse, instead of *Γεργεσενῶν*, *of the Gergesenes*, we read in the *Syriac*, *of the Gadarenes*: the *Greek* word *χαλεποί*, *fierce*, in the same place, is translated in the *Syriac* by this *ܠܐܠܐ* that is to say, *wicked*, or *cruel*, which answers to *saevi* in the *Vulgar*, for this *Syriac* word signifies both. In the 30th verse it is written in the *Syriac*, as in the *Greek*, *a good way off from them*; whereas it is in the *Vulgar*, *not far from them*; the *Syriac* words might also be render'd *beyond them*, which seems to make a more convenient sense. The *Syrian* Interpreter doth not literally express the 32d verse, having added some words, so that it may be esteemed as a *Paraphrase*, rather than a verbal Translation.

In the 9th Chapter, verse 4. it is not read in the *Syriac* *ἰδὼν*, *seeing*, as it is in the *Greek*, but *εἰδὼς*, *knowing*. In the 8th verse of the same Chapter, where we read in the ordinary *Greek* *ἐθαύμαζον*, *they marvelled*, it is written in the *Syriac*, as in some ancient *Greek* Manuscript, *ἐφοβήθησαν*, *they were afraid*; and we likewise read in the *Vulgar*, *timuerunt*, according to this reading. In the 13th verse we do not find in the *Syriac*, nor in the *Vulgar*, nor even in some ancient *Greek* Copies, *εἰς μετάνοιαν*, *to repentance*. In the 18th verse, we read in the *Syriac*, *one*, and *unus* in the *Vulgar* after *ἄρχων*, and this word *εἷς* is also expressed in some *Greek* Copies. In the 30th verse, the word *immediately* is read in the *Syriac* before *ἀνεώχθησαν*, *were opened*; this reading is confirmed by one of *Robert Stephen's* Manuscripts in which there is *ὁμοχρησῖμα*. In the 35th verse, we do not read in the *Syriac*, in the *Vulgar*, nor in some *Greek* Manuscripts, *ἐν πᾶσι λαῶ*, *among the people*. In the 36th verse, where it is in the ordinary *Greek* *ἦσαν ἐκλελυμένοι*, *they fainted*, we find in the *Syriac* Translation, as in the *Latin* and in several *Greek* Copies, *ἦσαν ἐσκυλημένοι*, *they were tired*.

In the 10th Chapter, verse 1. where it is in the ordinary *Greek*, *πνευμάτων*, *of spirits*, we find in the *Syriac*, as in some *Greek* Copies, *κατὰ πνευμάτων*, *against spirits*. In the 2d verse of the same Chapter, instead of

of Πέτρος, *Peter*, which is in the *Greek*, we read in the *Syriac*, as above, **ܐܬܬܐ** a *stone*. In the 4th verse, where we read in the ordinary *Greek*, Ἰσκαριώτης, *Iscariot*, the *Syriac* hath simply, **ܫܥܪܝܘܬܝܬܐ**, *Scariot*, which reading is confirmed by the *Cambridge Copy*. In the 8th verse, these words are read in the *Syriac*, *raise the dead*, as in the ordinary *Greek Copies*; and they are likewise expressed in our *Vulgar*, but in a different order from the *Greek*; the *Lowain Divines*, who believed that they did not belong to the Text of *St. Matthew*, have marked them with an obelisk in their Edition; and indeed they are not inserted in some *Latin Copies*. In the 12th verse, these words are not read in the *Syriac*, which are in several *Greek Copies*, and in our *Latin Edition*, saying, *Peace be to this house*. The *Syrian Interpreter* seems to have read ἀπλῆστατοι in the 16th verse, conformably to the *Cambridge Manuscript*, instead of ἀλέστατοι, having translated it **ܕܡܕܢܚܐ** that is to say, *simple*; as the *Vulgar* hath *simplices*. In the 23d verse, where it is in the *Greek* simply, τὰς πόλεις, *the Cities*, it is render'd in the *Syriac* as if it were read πᾶσας τὰς πόλεις, *all the Cities*. In the 25th verse, we read in the *Syriac* as in the *Vulgar*, *Beelzebub*; whereas it is written in the ordinary *Greek Copies* *Beelzeboul*. In the 38th verse, the *Syrian Translator* hath expressed the *Greek Verb* λαμβάνει, *taketh*, by **ܕܠܚܝܩܐ** *carrieth*; and indeed the same Verb *nasca*, among the *Hebrews* signifies, *to take*, and *to carry*.

In the 11th Chapter, verse 2. we do not read *two*, in the *Syriac*, as it is in the ordinary *Greek Copies*, but **ܕܝܐ**, *by*, as it is written in the ancient Manuscript of *Cambridge*. In the 8th verse of the same Chapter, instead of the *Greek word* ἀλλὰ, *but*, we find *two* in the *Syriac* **ܐܝܢ** *if not*; but perhaps it ought to be read by a single word, thus, **ܐܝܢ** which signifies *but*. In the 19th verse, where it is expressed in the *Greek* and in the *Vulgar*, *of her children*, it is translated in the *Syriac*, *by her works*; as if this Interpreter had read ἔργων instead of τέκνων, or rather, he had respect onely to the sense.

In the 12th Chapter, verse 4. where we read in the *Greek*, τὰς ἄρτους τοῦ σκεδάσματος, *the shew-bread*; it is render'd in the *Syriac* rather according to the sense than the words, *the bread of the Lord's table*; the *Syrian Interpreter* hath very well translated the *Greek word* εἰμὴν, which according to the Grammatical sense signifies, *unless*, in expressing it by the single word **ܐܝܢ** *but*. In the 5th verse, these words, τοῖς σάββατον, *on the sabbath-days*, are not inserted in the *Syriac*. In the 10th verse, after **ܐܝܢ**, *there was*, we find in the *Syriac* this word, **ܕܢܝܢ**, *in that place*, as it is in some ancient *Greek Copies*. In the 12th verse, instead of the Particle **ܐܝܢ**, *then*, which is in the *Greek*, the *Syriac* hath **ܐܝܢ** *now*, which makes a better sense. In the 31st verse, where it is in the *Greek*, πνεύματι, the *Syrian Interpreter* hath translated *against the holy Ghost*, as if he had read **ܕܢܝܢ** *against*, or rather he hath followed the sense.

In the 13th Chapter, verse 16. the word *αὐτοῖς*, is added after *μαθηταί*, *his disciples*. Since these kinds of additions are frequent in the Versions, it would be needless to insist thereon, because they usually proceed from the Translators. Thus the Syrian Interpreter after *συνέβη* hath added *οὗτο* *αὐτόν*, this Pronoun being necessary to render the sense more clear.

In the 32d verse, the word *πάντων*, of all, is read after *μεῖζον*, the greatest, in the Syrian, which is not in the ordinary Greek: It is also expressed in the Vulgar according to this reading, *omnibus*. In the 36th verse, the Syrian Interpreter hath translated, *of the tares and of the field*, as if he had read in his Greek Copy, *καὶ τὰ ἄγρια*. In the 46th verse, whereas it is in the ordinary Greek, *ὅς εὗρον*, who when he had found, it is read in the Syrian, as in the Vulgar, *εὗρον δ*, but when he had found. In the 51st verse, we read these words in the Syrian as well as in the ordinary Greek, which are not found in the Vulgar, nor in the Cambridge Manuscript, *Jesus saith unto them*. In the 52d verse, where it is read in the Greek, *μαθητεύδεις*, instructed, the Syrian hath *ⲙⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁⲓ*; that is to say, as Gabriel Sionita hath render'd it, *who shews himself a disciple*, which makes a good sense.

In the 14th Chapter, verse 1. the Syrian Translator hath retained the Greek word *τελεεργεῖς*, and Syriacized it. In the 3d verse, we read in the Syrian, as in the ordinary Greek, *Φίλιππος*, Philip, but this word is not expressed in our Latin Edition, nor in the Cambridge Manuscript. In the 19th verse, the Syrian Interpreter had not in his Greek Copy *τὰς ἄρτους*, the loaves: And in the 24th verse, where it is in the Greek, *ἤδη μέσον τῆ θαλάσσης*, now in the midst of the sea; he hath translated the sense rather than the words after this manner, *was many furlongs distant from the land*. In the 34th verse, instead of *Γεννησαρέτ*, Gennesaret, it is read in the Syrian as in the Vulgar, *Genesar*; which reading is confirmed by the Copy of the Marquês de Velec.

In the 15th Chapter, verse 2. the Greek word *παράδοσιν* is very well expressed in the Syrian by the word *ⲓⲕⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁⲓ* which signifies *tradition*, even according to the Grammatical sense. In the 5th verse the words *ἐξ ἐμῶ* are transposed, and read after the Verb *ὀφελυνθῆς* in this verse, *my offering is that which will be profitable to you on my behalf*. In the 8th verse, these words are not read in the Syrian, which are in the ordinary Greek; *ἡγίζεσθαι ... ὁ λαὸς ἐτῷ τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ*, this people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth; neither are they inserted in our Vulgar, conformably to the ancient Manuscript of Cambridge, where it is simply, *ὁ λαὸς ἐτῷ τοῖς χειλεσὶ με τιμᾷ*, this people honoureth me with their lips. In the 15th verse, instead of *ὁ Πέτρος*, Peter, it is in the Syrian, *Simon Cepha*. In the 19th verse, the word *μοιχεύει*, adulteries, precedes that of *φόνος*, murders. In the 24th verse, where we read in the Greek, *τὰ ἀπολωλότα*, lost; it is expressed in the Syrian according to the sense by a word that signifies *strayed*. In the 27th verse, these words, *and live*, are added in the Syrian after *αὐτοῖς*, which seem to be a Gloss, because they are not in any other

other Copy. In the 31st verse, these words, *ὅλλυς ὄνεις*, the maimed to be whole, are in the Syriac, as well as in the ordinary Greek, but they are not found in our Latin Edition; neither hath the Marquis de Velec read them in any of his Manuscripts. In the 36th verse, where it is read in the Greek, *εὐχαρισῶν*, gave thanks, we find the Verb *ⲁⲩ* in the Syriac, which signifies, be praised, that is to say, he repeated the Prayer that the Jews call praise or benediction, which perfectly expresses the sense of this passage. We read also in the same place in the Syriac the Verb gave after *μαθηταί*, disciples, as in the Vulgar; but it is not in the Greek. In the 37th verse, the Greek word *σπείρας*, baskets, is retained and Syriacized. In the 39th verse, whereas we read in the ordinary Greek *Μαγδαλά*, Magdala, the Syriac hath *Magedo*, which comes near *Magedan* in the Vulgar.

In the 16th Chapter, verse 3. instead of *διναδι*, can, which is in the ordinary Greek, it is written in the Syriac *οὐκίε*, know, as it is also read in some Greek Copies; moreover this Interpreter hath added, discern, having translated this passage thus, know ye not how to discern. The word *scire* is likewise found in the Vulgar, though it is not in the ordinary Greek. In the 11th verse, the word *ἀλλὰ*, but, is added in the Syriac after *ὑμῶν*, which makes a good sense. In the 13th verse, where it is in the ordinary Greek, *ἐγώ*, that I, it is read in the Syriac, *ⲁⲩ* of me, this Pronoun is not expressed in the Vulgar, nor in some Greek Copies. In the 23d verse, instead of *με* the Syrian Interpreter hath read *ἐμοί*, unto me, conformably to the Cambridge Manuscript, and the Vulgar hath *mibi*, according to this reading. In the 27th verse, where we read in the ordinary Greek, *Ἀγγέλων*, Angels, it is written in the Syriac, *holy Angels*; as it is also written in some ancient Greek Copies.

It were needless to instance in a greater number of passages in St. Matthew's Gospel, and even to insist any longer on the Syriac Version of the New Testament, seeing that those we have already produced are sufficient to shew its exactness, and we are thereby informed at the same time, that it confirms our Latin Edition in many places; therefore the ordinary Greek ought not always to serve as a rule in our Critical Enquiries: Since this Translation is very ancient, it is not to be admired that it sometimes agrees with the Cambridge Manuscript, and consequently with the *Italic*; but it may be affirmed in general, that it more frequently agrees with the Greek Copies by which St. Jerom revised the ancient Vulgar translation, than with those to which this last was conformable. We read for example in the Syriac, the 14th verse of the 23d Chapter of St. Matthew, which is not in the ancient MS. of Cambridge. It is rare to see any additions in the Syriac Version of the New Testament that are not supported by some Greek Copy, and when this happens, they ought rather to be attributed to the Transcribers than to the diversity of the Copies. Thus we read in the 28th Chapter of St. Matthew, verse 18. after *ὑμῖν*, earth, these words, *and as my Father hath sent*

me, even so send I you, which are in no Greek Copy in this place, but onely in the Persian translation that was made from the Syriac; they were taken out of the 20th Chapter of St. John, verse 21.

Furthermore, this Version is not altogether so pure in the Epistles of St. Paul as in the Gospels; for in regard that the style of those Epistles is obscure and intricate, the Syrian Interpreter hath taken more Liberty therein, departing sometimes from his Original; this he begins to doe in the very first words of the Epistle to the Romans; for whereas it is read in the Greek simply *κλητὸς ἀπόστολος*, he hath translated, as if it were *καὶ ἀπόστολος*, called and an Apostle; nevertheless, St. Paul hath not separated these two words; and the sense is, that he was called to be an Apostle. In the 4th verse of this Chapter, where we read in the Greek, *τὸ δειδνένον*, declared, or determined, in the Vulgar, *qui prædestinatus est*, who was predestinated, it is expressed in the Syriac by word that signifies, and was known, which doth not exactly answer the Greek word that properly imports determined, and this ought also to be understood in this place in our Vulgar, by the word *prædestinatus*. However, with respect to the sense, this same Verb which signifies among the Syrians, was known, doth likewise signifie, was ordained or appointed.

In the 6th verse of this same Chapter, where we read in the Greek, *κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, the called of Jesus Christ, it is translated in the Syriac, called in Jesus Christ, or rather, by Jesus Christ, as it is also in the Vulgar; for the Preposition *ἐν* signifies, as in the Hebrew tongue, in and by. In the 9th verse, the Syrian Interpreter hath left out the Pronoun *με*, having translated this passage simply *ἐν πνεύματι*, or *per spiritum*, as if he had only read in his Copy *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*, which renders the sense ambiguous, because it might be indifferently applied to his own, and to the Spirit of God. Moreover, this Interpreter hath distinguished the 9th and 10th verses after another manner than they are in the ordinary Greek, for he comprizeth all these words under one connexion, *μενείαν ὑμῶν ποιεῖν πάντῃς ἐν ᾧ ἄς προσευχῶν με*. I make mention of you always in my prayers: and reads afterwards in the following verse, *καὶ δέωον*, and making supplication; nevertheless this doth not alter the sense. But since it is not expedient to run through all the Epistles of St. Paul, it may suffice to intimate in general, that the Syrian Interpreter hath taken a much greater liberty in those Epistles than in the Gospels. I shall onely add here, that the Syrians, in all their Copies, acknowledge the Epistle to the Hebrews to be certainly written by this Holy Apostle; for they mention fourteen in the general Title under the name of St. Paul.

C H A P. XVI.

Of the Coptics ; Of their Language ; and of their Version of the Holy Scriptures in the Coptic tongue ; and chiefly of that of the New Testament.

IT cannot be denied, but that the People of *Egypt* have had the Bible translated into the Language of their Countrey, since mention is made thereof in the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers. The Successors of *Alexander*, who kept their Court at *Alexandria*, brought thither the *Greek* tongue : however, this doth not hinder but that the *Egyptian* might remain in several places ; especially in *Thebais*, where nevertheless it was not so pure as at first ; insomuch that that part of this Language which is left to us at this day, is intermix'd with an infinite number of *Greek* words, from whence its Characters have been also borrowed. The word *Coptic* is the same as that of *Egypt*, the pronunciation being onely altered, as it usually happens to proper Names in process of time.

Mr. *Vossius*, who delights in maintaining Paradoxes, believes that there was no *Coptic* before *Egypt* was subdued by the *Arabians*, because this Language (according to his opinion) is a mixture of the *Greek* and the *Arabian* ; since the very name of *Coptic* was not known in the World before the *Arabians* became Masters of *Egypt* : *Ne nomen quidem* (saith he) *Copticae linguae exstitit antequam Arabes potirentur Aegypto. Ipsa quin etiam id satis testatur lingua, quæ tota ex Græco & Arabico translata est sermone.*

If. Voss.
Resp. ad
iter. P.
Sim. ob.

But he himself acknowledges that these two words *Egyptus* and *Egyptus* are the same : I grant that these People pronounced the word *Coptic* instead of that of *Egyptian*, since the *Arabic* was spoken among them, but can it be inferred from thence, that there was no *Egyptian* tongue before that time ? This onely proves that that which hath been formerly called *Egyptian*, was afterwards, by a corruption of the Language, named *Coptic* : And although we should admit that the *Arabians* have introduced some words of their Language into the ancient *Coptic* or *Egyptian* ; can Mr. *Vossius* conclude from thence, that there was no *Coptic* or *Egyptian* tongue before that time ? he might avouch with as much reason, that the *Persians* and *Turks* do no longer speak their ancient tongue, because they are mingled with an infinite number of *Arabic* words, and indeed have no other Characters but those of the *Arabians* : the example that he produceth of the Language which was used among the *Gauls* before *Cæsar's* time, and which is not the same as the present *French*, is foreign from the purpose ; for it is certain that our *French* is not derived from this ancient *Gaulish* tongue : moreover, it is not true, that the *Coptic* is nothing else but a mixture of the *Greek* and *Arabic*. Mr. *Vossius* ought likewise to have added, *and of the Latin* ; for there are some *Latin* words in this Language,

If. Voss.
Resp. ad
tert. P.
Sim. obj.

Language, the proper foundation of which is the ancient *Egyptian*, distinguished from the *Greek* and *Arabic*: The *Greek* was admitted into it a long while before the appearing of the Christian Religion, and the *Arabic* words that are found therein may also be very ancient, and before the Dominion of the *Arabians* over that Countrey. The Geographers affirm, that the Capital City of *Thebais* called *Coptos* was the place to which the *Arabians*, *Indians* and *Ethiopians* brought their Merchandizes: and therefore it is no wonder that the commerce of the *Egyptians* with the *Arabians* and *Ethiopians* hath introduced some *Arabic* words into the *Coptic* or *Egyptian* tongue, the *Ethiopian* being almost nothing else but a dialect of the *Arabic*.

Cod. MS. We find in the King's Library a Copy of the IV. Gospels written in
Bibl. Reg. fair *Coptic* Characters by a Bishop of *Damietta*, about 500 years ago, it
n. 329. imitates the *Greek*, from which it was taken, having the same Sections
marked in the margents. This properly is common to all the *Coptic* Co-
pies that have exactly followed the *Greek* from which they were transla-
ted, and this is one proof of their antiquity, that they agree with our
Latin Edition in several places where it is not conformable to the ordina-
ry *Greek* Text. The above mentioned *Coptic* Manuscript contains in the
Gospel of St. *John*, the history of the adulterous woman, which answers
as in the *Greek*, to the little Section πς. 86 Mr. *Marshall* assures us, that
he also read it in a like *Coptic* Manuscript; but it is not in another MS.
of this same Library which is divided into two Columns, one whereof
is written in *Coptic*, and the other in *Arabic*. In the first Manuscript,
which is purely *Coptic*, certain Pictures of a sufficient largeness are
painted in divers places; there is one, amongst others, wherein our Savi-
our is represented giving his Body to his Disciples, when he instituted
their Sacrament; they bow in receiving the Bread which their Master
delivered to them to eat, and are in a posture that shews their adorati-
on, conformably to the custome used at that time in the Church of
the *Coptics*; moreover, these words are added, written in *Arabic*, to ex-
press what is exhibited in this Figure; *The Lord Christ gives bread to his*
Disciples which he hath consecrated and made his Body and Bloud. There is
also in the King's Library another Manuscript in the *Coptic* tongue, that
contains the Epistles of St. *Paul*, the Catholic Epistles, and *The Acts of*
the Apostles; and that which chiefly deserves to be observed therein is,
that all the Catholic Epistles are inserted as in our *Greek* Copies, and in the
same order, viz. one of St. *James*, two of St. *Peter*, three of St. *John*,
and one of St. *Jude*. Farthermore, the Testimony of the Father, the
Word, and the Holy Ghost, is not read in the I. Epistle of St. *John*, as
it is not in the most part of the *Greek* Copies. There is found in this same
Library another Copy of the Epistles of St. *Paul* written in *Coptic* and
Arabic.

Cod. MS. These *Coptic* Manuscripts, as hath been already remarked, have pre-
Bibl. Reg. served the distinctions of the *Greek* Copies, from which the *Coptic* Version
n. 332. of

of the New Testament was composed. We read, for example, at the end of the Manuscript that contains *The Acts of the Apostles*, *δεξιων τον αχον αποστολων εν ειρηνη τω Κυριω, Αμην. Κεφαλεον οζ. συχον τοζ.* Thus the Coptics reckon in *The Acts* 77 Sections or Chapters, and 307 verses: they observe this method in all the other Books, in which they distinguish two kinds of Sections, as in the Greek Manuscripts, viz. the greater, which they call *Κεφαλαια*, and the lesser that are marked in the margents. We shall proceed to illustrate this by some examples. They reckon in the Epistle to the *Romans* κεφαλαια κα. 21. great Sections, and πζ. 87. lesser: they call these small Sections *Coygi*, and sum up at the end of the Epistle to the *Galatians* συχ. τιβ. κεφαλεον ζ. Coygi λα. that is to say, 312. verses, 6. great Sections, and 31. lesser. At the end of the Epistle to the *Ephesians* συχ. τιβ. κεφαλεον ζ. Coygi λ. 312. verses, 6. great Sections, and 30. lesser. At the end of the Epistle to the *Philippians* συχ. ςιη. κεφ. δ. Coygi κα. 118. verses, 4. great Sections, and 21. lesser, and so of the others.

They observe not the same order as we do in the Epistles of St. Paul; for the Epistle to the *Hebrews* is placed in their Copies immediately after the Second to the *Thessalonians*; after the Epistle to the *Hebrews* follow the two to *Timothy*, that to *Titus*, and the Epistle to *Philemon*, which is the last of all. They reckon in the Epistle to the *Hebrews* συχον ιε. κεφαλεον ια. Coygi ξβ. 755. verses, 11. great Sections, and 62. Coygi. If there be no fault in the numbers, the measure of their verses doth not seem to be certain and determined. They believe that St. Paul is the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* as well as of the others, attributing fourteen to him, as it appears by these words which are in one of their Copies, at the end of these Epistles, Παυλε τε αγιος αποστου δπωςλη ιδ. εν ειρηνη τω Κυριω, Αμην. Ομς συχ. εφο. κεφαλεον ςθ. Κεδιας υοκ. Since they took these kinds of computations from the *Grecians*, they wrote them also for the most part in *Greek*, which have been altered by the Copiers who did not understand them, they observe this likewise with respect to the Titles of every Book. We read, for example, at the beginning of the Epistle of Saint *James*, καθολικον δπωςλη Ιακωβ. and at the end, κεφαλεον η. συχος μα. counting in this Epistle 8. great Sections, and 41. verses. The same thing is practised by them in the other Canonical Epistles, which they annex to those of St. Paul. *The Acts of the Apostles* (according to their division) compose the last part of the New Testament.

Father Kircher hath mentioned some *Coptic* Manuscripts of the Bible which he had seen at *Rome* in the Library of the *Vatican*, and among others a Copy of the four Gospels, in which there are Figures, as in that of the King's Library; he gives an account also of a Manuscript that contains the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, three Canonical Epistles only, and *The Acts of the Apostles*, and lastly, of a Copy in which the *Revelation* was written in *Coptic* and *Arabic*, with this Title, Αποκαλυψις τε αγιου Ιωαννης ευαγγελιστ. It is to be admir'd that this Jesuit, who discoursed in the same place concerning a *Coptic Pentateuch*, should seek for reasons among

Athen.
Kirch.
Prodr.
Cop. c. 8.

among the *Samaritans* of the number of the Sections and Verses that are found in the Books of the *Coptics*, who in this particular have imitated the *Grecians*, whose Books they translated into their Language. There are also in the King's Library some parts of the Old Testament in the *Coptic* tongue, viz. a Psalter in *Coptic* and *Arabic*, another Psalter purely *Coptic*, and a Volume which contains the Prophets, *Hosea*, *Amos*, *Micah*, *Joel*, *Obadiab*, *Jonab*, *Nabum*, *Zephaniah*, *Haggai*, *Zecharia*, *Malachi* and *Daniel*, which are all written in *Coptic* and *Arabic*. Moreover, we find in the same Library a Lectionary absolutely *Coptic*, taken out of the Gospels, *The Acts of the Apostles*, the Epistles of St. Paul, and the *Psalms*, which is divided according to the principal Feasts of the *Coptic* Churches. That which shews that those Nations do still continue to recite their Office in the ancient tongue, which is not now understood by them is, that this Lectionary is purely *Coptic*, except the Rubrics, that are written in *Coptic* and *Arabic*. Besides this, there is a Lectionary taken out of *The Acts* and Gospels with this Title, *Αποστολική Λειτουργία*, which is likewise entirely *Coptic*, the Rubrics onely being in *Coptic* and *Arabic*.

However, it is not to be doubted but that these People have translated their Books of Offices or Rituals into *Arabic*, which is their mother-tongue, but they annex these Versions onely to some Copies, because it is sufficient for the use of their Churches that they are in *Coptic*, with the Rubrics in *Arabic*: They read the *Arabic* Translations in private, whether they are joyned to their *Coptic* Books, or whether they are transcribed separately. Thus we find in the King's Library a Lectionary for the whole time of Lent written in *Coptic* and *Arabic*, which is composed of the Gospels and of the Epistles of St. Paul. They have in like manner translated into *Arabic* certain Hymns in honour of the Virgin *Mary* and of the Saints, a Copy of which is to be seen in the King's Library.

C H A P. XVII.

Of the Ethiopic Version of the New Testament. Of the Armenian Version. A Relation of what lately happened at Marseille concerning the Printing of the Armenian Books: The History of Mesrop, who was the first that invented the Armenian Characters. Of the Persian translation of the New Testament.

THE New Testament was printed in the *Ethiopic* tongue at Rome in the year 1548. but this Edition is very imperfect; the Publishers thereof had at that time in *Ethiopic*, onely the four Gospels, the *Revelation*, the seven Canonical Epistles, *The Acts of the Apostles*, and the E-
pistle

pistle to the *Hebrews*; therefore these Books alone were printed at first with this Title, *Testamentum Novum cum Epistola Pauli ad Hebræos*, and the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was placed before *The Acts of the Apostles*: afterwards the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul were published separately, which being annexed to the other Books, compose the whole New Testament. All this is expressed in these words, in an Epistle inserted at the end of the Gospels, *Adverte, Lector, quod Epistola ad Hebræos suo loco non est, posita est autem à nobis ante Acta Apostolorum. Hoc autem ideo factum est, quia cum quatuor Evangelia, Apocalypsim, septem Canonicas Epistolas & Acta typis jam hinc biennio excudi fecerimus, Pauli Epistolas Italiae non habebamus, nisi illam quæ est ad Hebræos.* The principal Author of this Edition mentioned in the same place, is *Tesfa Sion*, who was assisted by *Petrus Paulus Gualterius Aretinus, & Marianus Victorius, Qui in hoc opere labores perpassi sunt hi fuerunt, Petrus Tesfa Zeon Malexo filius Tecla Haimanot de monte Libano in Monasterio S. Stephani quod in Vaticano positum Ethiopum est, & Petrus Paulus Gualterius Aretinus, & Marianus Victorius Reatinus in hoc & in aliis operibus adjutores mei.* But whatsoever pains they might have taken in publishing this New Testament: they could not succeed well in this Undertaking, as not having any good *Ethiopic* Copies: They declare that they were obliged to re-establish several passages in *The Acts of the Apostles* that were wanting in their *Ethiopic* MSS. by the help of the Greek and Latin. Mr. Ludolf, who hath likewise made this observation, adds, that it is to be feared that they had done the same thing with respect to the other Books of the New Testament: and he insists on this, that he was informed by an *Ethiopian*, that the MSS. Copies of that Countrey differed very much from this printed Edition. *Verendum est (says he) ne idem in cæteris Novi Testamenti libris fecerint; quippe Ethiops meus in multis eos differre aiebat ab exemplaribus MSS. patriæ suæ.* Upon the whole matter, this Version of the New Testament that was printed at Rome, and reprinted in the Polyglott Bible of England, is so little exact, that it deserves no farther consideration.

Ludolf.
Præf. in
Lex. Æth.

This People commonly call their tongue *Chaldaic*, as if it were really the ancient Language of the *Chaldeans* or *Babylonians*, whereas it is very different from it, and comes nearer to the *Arabic* than to the true *Babylonish* Idiom; it might be styled *Axumic*, because it is the Language that was spoken at *Axuma*, when their Kings resided there; but their Court being afterwards removed into the middle of the Kingdom, this tongue began by little and little to be disused, and was reserved to the Learned; insomuch that some of them name it *the language of the Books*, because indeed it is onely found therein. The dialect called of *Ambura* hath taken its place, so that they are esteemed as learned men at this day in *Ethiopia*, who are expert in reading and writing the old *Ethiopic*, which is retained in the public Service of the Churches. This may be seen more at large in the History of *Ethiopia* composed by Mr. Ludolf.

Ludolf.
Hist. Æth.
l. 1. c. 14.

The *Psalms*, the *Canticles*, and some Chapters of *Genesis*, *Ruth*, *Joel*,
Jonah,

Ludolf. ib.
lib. 3.

Jonah, *Zephaniah* and *Malachi*, which have been printed in *Ethiopic* are conformable to the *Septuagint*, or rather to the *Coptic Version*, which was made from that of the *LXX* Interpreters. Since the *Ethiopians* or *Abyssins* depend on the Patriarch of the *Coptics*, they agree with them in all matters of Religion. I believe that there are more *Ethiopic* Books in the Library of Mr. *Seguier*, late Chancellor of *France*, than there are at present in all *Ethiopia*; for this famous Magistrate bought a complete Library of an *Abuna*: They join in the Body of their Bible without any distinction, the Books that the Protestants call Apocryphal with the Canonical. Mr. *Ludolf* seems to attribute this to their ignorance or negligence. *Canonicis* (says this Historian) *Apocryphos miscent, incuria an ignorantia incertum*. But there is neither ignorance nor negligence in this particular, for they follow the Custom of the Eastern Churches. Mr. *Ludolf* confesses that a certain *Ethiopian*, named *Gregory*, whom he employed, understood not the meaning of the word Apocryphal; *Gregorius certe fatebatur se tale vocabulum nunquam audivisse*. This shews that those People have the same respect for the Books called Apocryphal by the Protestants, as for all the others: but this is not a proper place to enlarge on this subject; I shall only observe by the way that Mr. *Ludolf*, who was prepossess'd with the *Lutheran* Confession of Faith, hath often caused the *Ethiopians* to speak the language of the *Lutherans*.

As for the *Armenian* New Testament, I have little to add to what I have elsewhere related concerning the *Armenian* Bibles. I had some Conferences at *Paris*, in the year 1670. with *Uscan*, an *Armenian* Bishop, who was deputed by his Patriarch in a Council of his Nation assembled anno 1662. to go into *Europe*, to cause their Bible to be printed, and some other Books that were become very scarce. I was informed by him that an entire *Armenian* Bible before it was printed, was sold for at least 500 Crowns. The great diversity that was found among their Copies, was also one of the reasons that induced them to print their Bible, that they might preserve a certain uniformity in the reading of the Holy Scriptures. *Uscan* having procured the Old and New Testament to be printed in *Holland*, passed into *France*, and obtained of the King a privilege to print the Books of his Nation at *Marseille*, where he died; however, they desisted not to continue the same project, which nevertheless was interrupted by reason of the difference that happened thereupon, and which made so great a noise in the World, that the Intendant of *Provence* was obliged to take cognizance thereof. This affair came afterwards even to the King's Council, in which it was determined that they should be permitted to continue the Printing of the *Armenian* Books at *Marseille*, according to the tenour of the Privilege that was granted to them by his Majesty. Furthermore, his Edition of the New Testament, and even of the whole Bible, must needs be exact, because this Bishop, who was a learned and judicious Person, brought along with him very good MSS. Copies which he hath exactly followed.

It

It were to be wished that an *Armenian* Priest sent from *Rome* in quality of an Apostolic Missionary and Overseer of the *Armenian* Impressions in *France* had not met with so easie a reception at *Marseille*. Although this Priest hath caused some passages in the Writings of the *Armenians*, relating to their Rites, to be corrected, and hath accused his Countrey-men for printing Books that were filled with errors and even heresies; nevertheless, I can avouch that those corrections have not passed into their Bibles, but onely into some Books of their Office; and the Reformation it self is of no importance. Forasmuch as this affair hath been the subject of much talk, I shall here give a brief account thereof, having had in my hands the greatest part of the original Pieces relating to this matter.

This Priest, named *Thomas Herabied*, having resided some time at *Paris* in the Seminary of the foreign Ministers, applied himself to the study of Controversies, and having imbibed prejudicate notions from this sort of study, he vigorously opposed the Printing of the *Armenian* Books, which he pretended to be full of heresies. Mr. *Beaufset*, Grand Vicar of his Lordship the Bishop of *Marseille*, Mr. *Amiraut*, Superiour of the Missions of the same City, and even the Judges of the Place were favorable to him. The *Armenians*, on the other side, were vindicated by a learned Doctor of *Sorbonne*, and by Father *Pidou*, a *Theatin* Monk, who was employed in the Missions of the *Levant*; but they could obtain nothing. *Solomon de Leon*, one of the Associates in the Printing, died of grief in the prosecution of this Process, which was of a very great consequence to them; for they caused their Books to be printed in *France*, onely to distribute them afterwards throughout all the places where their Nation was dispersed; but if they should alter them (as it was required) they would run the hazzard of not publishing them, therefore they cannot be suspected of having reformed any thing in their New Testament printed at *Holland*, where they had no Overseer on the behalf of the Court of *Rome*.

Mem. de
Mr. Beauf.
Lett. de
Mr. Amir.
à un Doct.
de Sorb.

Mr. *Morant*, Intendant of *Provence*, received Letters from the King with an order to maintain the *Armenians* in the enjoyment of the Privilege that he had granted to them for the Printing of their Books; his Majesty judged upon the accusations exhibited against *Thomas Herabied*, that he ought not to exercise the function of an Inquisitor at *Marseille*, this quality not being given to him in the Brief of the Congregation de *Propaganda Fide*, that this Brief was onely a pretence for a Pension that had been granted to him by this Congregation; and that for the future *Thomas* might continue his residence at *Marseille*, where he might employ himself to good purpose in the Conversion of the *Turks*; He was only ordered not to assume to himself any other Functions but those that should be appointed to him by his Bishop, without interposing in the Printing of the *Armenian* Books, which *Solomon de Leon* could not finish but in a public capacity, and according to the terms expressed in his Pri-

vilege ; However, *Thomas* forbore not to be always Master of the Press, though the affair was carried on under the name of the Grand Vicar of *Marseille*, as it evidently appears by the *Catalogue of the heresies corrected in the Armenian Breviary*. *Thomas* was the Man that wrote this Catalogue, and presented it in a printed Petition to the Intendant of *Provence*. It would be too tedious to describe all these pretended errors in particular, it is sufficient to declare in general that none of them have any regard to the Bible ; and therefore they that have heard of this famous Controversie between the *Armenians* and the Correctors of their Books at *Marseille*, ought to take notice that those Corrections appertain solely to the Books that contain the Ecclesiastical Office of this Nation.

The Petit.
of Thom.
Herab. to
the Inten-
dent of
Provence.

I shall onely produce one of the principal, whence we may easily judge of the justice done to the *Armenians* at *Marseille*, when they were accused for printing Books full of impious doctrines and heresies : It is the third error mentioned in the Petition that was presented to the Intendant in these words, *It is ordained in three places of the Breviary, that they that say Mass on the solemn Festivals, and they that assist at the Sacrifice, ought to adore the Bread before the Consecration*. This Indictment brought against the *Armenians*, and the Correction which was inserted in this place in their Breviary, are altogether unjust. It is true indeed that M. the Grand Vicar of *Marseille* hath endavoured to justify himself as to the Alterations made by him in this passage of the *Armenian Liturgy*, but he will never cause his Reasons to be approved by those who have any knowlege of the Ceremonies of the Eastern Church ; for the *Armenian Office* contains nothing as to this particular matter but what is found in that of the *Grecians*, which hath been allowed at *Rome*.

The Dispute is concerning a Ceremony that the Oriental people use with great solemnity, when they carry the symbols of the Bread and Wine to the high Altar from that of the *Prothesis* : This Ceremony was not reformed in the Liturgy of the *Grecians* by those of *Rome* : although *Arcudius* and some zealous Missionaries were of opinion that it should entirely be taken away. *Herabied* imposes on his whole Nation in accusing them for rendring the same honour to the Symbols before Consecration as after, since their practice in this point is not singular. This Correction in the *Armenian Breviary* appeared to be so unreasonable to many Learned men, that they complained the Grand Vicar of *Marseille* had abused the *Armenians*, in leaving out of their Books the words that were found for a very long time in the Offices of the Oriental Christians. He answered, to vindicate himself, that he had given no just cause of offence to the *Armenians* ; that his Corrections were confirmed by the General Councils, and by the *Armenian Liturgy* corrected at *Rome* by the Congregation of *de Propaganda Fide* ; and in speaking concerning this Congregation, he adds, that it is not probable that persons so learned and so well affected to the Church intended without any necessity to exasperate by their proceedings a People whom they designed

Mem. de
Mr. Beauf.
pour Mr.
l'Ev. de
Marf.

to draw into the Communion of the Church of *Rome*. I am apt to believe that Mr. *Beaussset* had at least some seeming reasons to reform the *Armenian Books*. He was surprized by the illustrious Names of those wise and reverend Divines, &c. that compose the *Congregation de Propaganda Fide*. For as for the General Councils which he pretends to be favourable to him, he would find it very difficult to produce one to justify his Corrections. He would have acted much more discretely, if he had thereupon consulted the *Euchology* of the *Grecians* printed with the learned Notes of Father *Goar*; but if he had occasion to have recourse to *Rome*, to be resolved in this particular, he ought to reflect on the prudent conduct of Pope *Urban VIII.* who after having caused the *Grecian Euchology* to be examined, would not permit that it should be reformed by the Customs of the Church of *Rome*, according to the opinion of several Divines.

I confess that the Grand Vicar of *Marseille* was not so forward as *Thomas Herabied*, who insisted that the whole Ceremony should be expunged out of the *Armenian Office*; but he contented himself in blotting out some words which seemed to him to make an ill sense. We are informed of this by a Letter that *Herabied* wrote on this subject to a Doctor of *Sorbonne*; wherein he says, (a) *The Corrector having perused my Interpretation hath taken the middle way, leaving the whole Ceremony after the same manner as it is in the Breviary: He hath onely suppressed these words, the Priest adores, and these other words which the Priest pronounces when he shews the Host to the People, Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord.* Mr. *Beaussset* hath likewise used his utmost endeavours to vindicate his Corrections in a Memorial that he presented to his Bishop, which he affirms, that *the omission might as well pass for a fault in the printing, as for a correction made by the Bishop's authority.* But it would have been more expedient (in my judgment) not to mutilate a Ceremony which is permitted even at *Rome* in the Office of the *Grecians*, than to declare after it was altered, that these Corrections may be imputed to the Printer: *Thomas Herabied*, who is the true Author of them, and to whom the Grand Vicar onely lent his Name, very much aggravates this pretended Error, chiefly because the *Armenian Priests* give the Blessing to the People with the Bread and Wine which as yet had received but one single Benediction, and esteems this Ceremony as a manifest Idolatry. A learned Doctor of *Sorbonne*, having represented to him in a Letter which he wrote to him, that he was to be blamed for treating his brethren as Idolaters on the account of a Ceremony that ought to be re-

Lett. de
M.P. à Th.
Herab.
an. 1681.
11. Avr.

(a) *Corrector, post Interpretationem meam secutus medium iter reliquit totam Ceremoniam qualis est in Breviario, suppressis tantum verbis, Sacerdos adorat, & istis quæ prefert ostendens hostiam populo, Benedictus qui venit in Nomine Domini.* Tho. Herab. Epist. ad D. P. Doct. Sorb.

puted indifferent ; he replied to this Doctor , that it was true indeed , that the same Ceremony was observed among the *Grecians* , but that they advertized the People that those Elements were not as yet changed into the Body and Bloud of *Jesus Christ* ; as if the same Advertisements could not be given to the *Armenians* ; the truth is, there was no need of admonishing neither of those Nations, because they very well understood that the Symbols are not consecrated until the Priest hath recited the Prayer which they call, *The Invocation of the Holy Ghost* : They do not adore but when the Body and Bloud of *Jesus Christ* is shewn to them immediately before the Communion.

Epist. Th.
Her. ad D.
P. an 1681.
9. Mai.

We may be yet better able to judge of the reasons alledged by this *Armenian* Priest to correct the Ecclesiastical Office of his Nation in diverse places, if we reflect on this other Answer sent by him to the same Doctor of *Sorbonne*. (b) *We must (says he) make a distinction between the material or gross Armenians and the formal or obstinate. When the Books are corrected, they are not corrected for the material who are simple and good; but for the formal, who always dispute against the Church of Rome, from whom every thing ought to be taken away that may lead them into error.* Thus argued this Man, who assumed to himself the quality of *Apostolic Missionary at Marseille*, that he might take an occasion to correct the Books of the *Armenians* which were to be printed there with the King's Privilege. I have exhibited this History at length to no other purpose but to make it appear to all the World that these Corrections do not relate to the *Armenian* Bibles. And to the end that all doubts may be removed concerning this matter, I shall here produce the Catalogue of those Heresies that *Thomas Herabied* pretended to have taken out of the *Armenian* Breviary. This Catalogue is inserted in the Petition which he presented to Mr. *Morant* then Intendant of *Provence*.

A. Catalogue of the Heresies imputed to the Armenians.

“ The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone. In the Son, of two Natures which he had there is made but one. In three places of the Breviary, it is ordained that they that say Mass on the solemn Festivals, and they that assist at the Sacrifice, ought to adore the Bread before, after the same manner as after the Consecration. O holy, powerfull and immortal God, who wast incarned, who hast manifested thy self; who art come, and who oughtest to come; who wast betrayed, who wast buried, who didst rise again; who didst ascend with Glory to thy Father; who art come, and hast confided in the Apostles; who hast manifested thy self on the Mountain of *Tabor*; who camest to the assumption of the Virgin thy mother. By this means

(b) *Distinguendum est inter Armenos materiales seu crassos, & formales sive pertinaces. Quando emendantur libri, non emendantur pro materialibus qui sunt simplices & boni, sed pro formalibus qui semper disputant cum Ecclesia Romana, & illis debent precludi omnes viæ erroris.* Epist. Thom. Herab. ad D. P. ann. 1681. 9. Maii.

“ they

“ they attribute all these actions to the Trinity. O mother of God, who
 “ wast never married. He was begotten the onely Son of God the Fa-
 “ ther, that is to say, of the essence of the Father. In four places the Feast
 “ of the Annunciation is said to be on the twenty seventh day of *April*.
 “ In five places it is expressed, that the Church was built on the Faith
 “ of *Peter*. *Barsen* and *Maruta*, great Hereticks, were mentioned in the
 “ Breviary as Saints whom they invoke.

If I were not afraid of being too tedious, I could give a particular account of the injustice of the most part of those Accusations; but my design is onely to shew what was reformed in the Books of the *Armenians* printed at *Marseille*. And since this Correction hath respect merely to the Breviary or Ecclesiastical Office, it is sufficient that we have taken notice thereof in general, and produced the Catalogue of the pretended Errors in particular. Forasmuch as Mr. the Grand Vicar of *Marseille*, was onely the instrument of *Thomas Herabied*, because he could not correct Books written in a language which he did not understand; the same *Herabied* complains in a *Latin* Advertisement directed to the said Grand Vicar, that *Solomon*, who was the chief Manager of the Impression, had not punctually followed his Corrections. Mr. *Beauisset*, for example, had added after these words, *Sanctus Deus*, &c. these other, *Christe crucifixe. Ille posuit* (says *Thomas Herabied*, speaking of *Solomon*) *hæretico modo, Sanctus Deus qui crucifixus es, &c.* Moreover, the Grand Vicar of *Marseille*, who believed that he had a right to reform in the *Armenian* Books, even the Calendar of this Nation, had changed the 27th of *April* into the 25th of *March*. *Herabied* complained likewise that the 25 of *March* was not inserted in the printed Copy, as it was in the Correction. Lastly, This *Armenian* Priest makes mention of a certain Book entituled *Mastouach*, which also contained (as he says) some Heresies, and among others he declares that, although seven Sacraments were acknowledged in the Preface of this Work, nevertheless there were but six expressed in the body of the Book. The Printer (says he) hath excluded Extreme Unction from the number of the Sacraments. *Typographus*

Ecclesiæ Armenorum excludit e numero Sacramentorum Extremam Unctionem.

Tho. Her.
monit. ad
Vic. Gen.
Episc. Mas.

Since very little hath been said in the Critical History of the Old Testament concerning *Mesrop*, who invented the *Armenian* Characters, I shall here add some curious remarks appertaining to this matter, which may give us some light at the same time into the knowledge of the first Books that have been translated by the *Armenians* into their Language. There is extant in the King's Library a very large Volume in folio which contains the Lives of their Saints; the above-mentioned Bishop *Uscam*, being at *Paris*, was desired to translate the Life of St. *Mesrop*, which is in this Volume, out of *Armenian* into *Latin*, which he did; and this *Latin* Version is kept also in the same Library. I shall not spend time in rehearsing what is miraculous in the Life of this holy man, which is sup-

Cod. MS.
Arm. Bibl.
Reg.

posed.

posed to have been written by one of his Disciples. It is related therein for example, that the Characters which are used by the *Armenians* even at this day were divinely revealed to him in a Vision, conformably to the *Idea's* that he had already formed of them. It often happens that these Miracles have been afterwards added in the Lives of the Saints by later Writers, who intended thereby to honour their memory : But this is not the Subject of our present discourse. *Mesrop* was born in a place called *Hafecos*, in the Province of *Taron*, his Father, who caused him to be instructed in the Language and Sciences of the *Grecians*, was named *Vardan* : Our *Mesrop* was in favour with this Prince, called *Uram Scafu*, who made him his *Quæstor*, and sent him with his Disciples into *Mesopotamia* of the *Syrians*. *Regis Quæstor factus est. Sic missus Mesrop cum suis Discipulis in Mesopotamiam Syrorum.* He being then very industrious in searching for Characters to express his *Armenian* Tongue, became acquainted with all the Learned men that he could find in that Countrey, and among others with a *Syrian* Bishop named *Daniel*, who was of great reputation : This Bishop promised to delineate the Characters which he so passionately desired, but after they had studied together for a considerable time, their endeavours succeeded not, because they could not invent any Letters that were perfectly suitable to the *Armenian* Language, whereupon (as they say) he prayed to God, who caused an hand to appear to him, writing the wished for Characters on a Stone, after the same manner as he had conceived them in his mind.

Mesrop after this Vision, with the assistance of one of his Disciples called *Ruphan*, formed the *Armenian* Characters by the *Greek*, to which he made them conformable, *Transmutando secundum Armenos sine obliquitate syllabarum ex Græcis.* They resolved from that time to translate the whole Old Testament out of *Greek* into *Armenian*, and indeed they began with the Proverbs of *Solomon*, which was the first Work that hath been written in this Language. This happened under the Empire of *Theodosius* the younger ; *Uran Scafu* being then King of *Armenia*, and *Isaac* Patriarch of that Nation, *Mesrop* communicated to them his new Characters to the great satisfaction of this Prince and the Patriarch, who ordered Schools to be erected, to teach the reading of these Letters. *Mesrop*, travelling into *Iberia*, established Schools there also, and afterward returned into *Armenia*, where he met with the Patriarch *Isaac*, who translated the Writings of the *Syrians* into the *Armenian* Tongue. It may be observed that there were then no *Greek* Books among the *Armenians*, since they were all burnt by *Merusan*; the *Persian* Governours suffered none of them in their Jurisdictions, permitting the *Armenians* onely to read those that were written in the Language of the *Syrians* : This obliged *Isaac* to send *Mesrop* with several of his Disciples to *Constantinople*, where he was very well received by the Emperour *Theodosius* : it was chiefly after that time, that *Isaac*, the Patriarch of the *Armenians*, and the Monk *Mesrop* employed them-

selves in dispersing the Translations of the Bible in the *Armenian* tongue.

Moreover, it is recorded in this same Life, that they sent two of their Disciples, one of them was named *Eznac*, and the other *Joseph*, to *Edesa*, to translate the Holy Scriptures out of *Syriac* into *Armenian* in that Place, for the use of their Nation: *ut ex Syrorum lingua Sanctas Scripturas interpretantes in linguam Armenicam litteras commendarent suae regionis.* I shall leave it to those that understand the *Armenian* tongue to examine whether the Version which the *Armenians* have caused to be printed in *Holland* be taken from the *Greek* or the *Syriac*. It is certain that this People have composed their Service-Book in *Syriac*; and I have seen a Liturgy in this Language that was written for the use of the *Armenians*. These two Monks abovementioned, who translated the Bible out of *Syriac* into *Armenian*, resided also among the *Grecians*, and having learnt their Language, took pains in translating the *Greek* Books into *Armenian*. Many other Monks were sent likewise into *Greece*, who having acquired a sufficient knowledge in the Language and Divinity of the *Grecians*, interpreted the Books of the Holy Fathers and of the Councils. In a word, the whole Doctrine of the *Grecians* was transferred to the *Armenian* Churches, by the means of the Translations of their Writings that were made in the *Armenian* tongue. Come we now to the *Persian* Version of the Bible.

I do not apprehend wherein the usefulness of the *Persian* Version of the New Testament printed in the Polyglott Bible of *London*, can consist; for besides that it hath no authority, it was not composed from the *Greek* Original, but from the *Syriac* Translation, which the Interpreter hath not always well understood. *Thomas Gravins*, who hath made observations on this Version, which are printed in the VIth Volume of the Polyglott of *England*, is sensible of these defects; nevertheless Bishop *Walton* declares that this is the best of the two Editions of the *Persian* New Testament which are now extant, *Secundam* (says he, speaking of this Edition) *quam omnium antiquissimam & optimam judicavimus, tomo quinto hujus operis inseruimus una cum Versione Latina viri doctissimi D. Samuelis Clerici.* But they might have inserted in this Polyglott better pieces than this *Persian* Version, which hath nothing to re-commend it. As for the other *Persian* Translation which is likewise printed, since it is a Work altogether new, it were needless to insist thereon.

I do not believe that the Book written by Father *Jerom Xavier*, a missionary Jesuit, which contains the Life of *Jesus Christ*, ought to be reckoned in the number of the *Persian* Versions of the New Testament. It was printed in *Persian* by the Protestants of *Holland*, with the *Latin* Edit. Interpretation of *Ludovicus de Dieu*, under this Title; *Historia Christi Persice conscripta, simulque multis modis contaminata.* This Father was the Cousin of *St. Francis Xavier*; he composed this History of *Jesus Christ* at *Agra*, where he then resided, at the solicitation of the Great *Mogol*. It appears by several words which are in the *Persian*, that it was written at

Lugd. Bat.
tav. ann.
1639.

first in the *Portugal* Language, from which it was afterwards translated into the *Persian*. *Ludovicus de Dieu* hath sharply inveighed against this Work, by reason of the Additions taken out of the Apocryphal Books that are inserted therein; upon the whole matter, although this Protestant Divine hath not sufficiently observed the rules of moderation in his Preface and Notes; nevertheless it cannot be denied, but that it would have been more convenient to translate the pure Text of the Gospels into *Persian*, than to publish a mixture of those Gospels and of Apocryphal pieces under the Title of *The History of Jesus Christ*. *Ferom Xavier* hath also compiled another Work of the like nature, entituled, *The History of St. Peter*, which is not written with more exactness than the former.

C H A P. XVIII.

Of the Arabic Versions of the New Testament. An account of an Arabic Translation of the whole Bible which was corrected at Rome by our Latin Edition.

AS there is no Language more generally understood in the *Levant* than the *Arabic*; so we have many Versions of the New Testament in this Tongue, which have been composed by different Sects. The *Coptics*, the *Melchites*, and the *Syrians*, who are divided (as it hath been above observed) into *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, and *Maronites*, all have their *Arabic* Translations of the Holy Scriptures. *Augustinus Justinianus* is the first that hath published any thing in *Arabic*, in an *Hebrew*, *Greek*, *Chaldaic*, and *Arabic* Psalter printed at *Genoa*, in the year 1516. This *Arabic* Psalter was translated from the *Syriac*; the Author mentions in his Observations another *Arabic* Psalter, which he calls *Egyptian* or *Coptic*, and of which he makes use to supply the defects of his Copy styled by him the *Syrian*, because it was translated out of *Syriac* into *Arabic* by some of that Nation. We find also in our Libraries two sorts of MSS. Copies of the *Syriac* Version of the New Testament. The *Syrians*, in several of their *Syriac* Copies annex an *Arabic* Translation, which was taken from this *Syriac*. There is a Manuscript in the King's Library that contains the four Gospels in *Syriac*, with an *Arabic* Version over against it; nevertheless the Copier hath onely transcribed some of the first Sections of the *Arabic* in this Copy, which are found entire in other Manuscripts. These two Versions answer exactly one to another, even in the Rubrics which are expressed in the *Arabic* after the same manner as in the *Syriac*. It could not happen otherwise, since these *Arabic* Translations were made onely for the Instruction of those People who no longer understood

Cod. MS.
Syr. & Ar.
Bibl. Reg.
n. 285.

log
ut
illa
Pol
(
in S
Grae
post
in or

understood the *Syriac* tongue. But that which chiefly deserves to be remarked is, that they have always religiously preserved their ancient *Syriac* Version in the Service of their Church, and that they read the *Arabic* only in private.

1 There is a like Manuscript of the Epistles of St. Paul, with two columns, in Mr. Colbert's Library, in which the *Syriac* is on one side, and the *Arabic* on the other: this Copy which is written as to what relates to the *Syriac* in those old Characters called *Babylonian*, is more ancient than that of the King's Library. The *Syriac* and *Arabic* do likewise correspond one with the other: and as the Rubrics are not marked in the *Syriac*, so neither are they in the *Arabic*. These *Arabic* Copies of the New Testament may be called *Syrian*, to distinguish them from the others that are used by the *Coptics*. We find in the King's Library a Manuscript of the four Gospels divided into two columns, one of which is in *Coptic* and the other in *Arabic*: And although it is not very ancient, nevertheless it is written in a fair hand. *Erpenius* hath caused to be printed in the year 1616. an *Arabic* Version of the whole New Testament, which he took from a Copy that was written by the *Coptics*.

Cod. MS.
Syr. & Ar.
Bibl. Colb.
n. 4973.

It doth not appear that Bishop Walton hath perfectly understood this matter, when he concludes in speaking concerning the *Arabic* translation published by *Erpenius*, (a) that it is very ancient, because these words in the 6th Chapter of St. Matthew, which have been inserted for a long time at the end of the Lord's Prayer in the *Greek* Copies, are wanting in this; *For thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, for ever.* This only proves the antiquity of the *Coptic* Version, and not of the *Arabic* translation which was taken from it. Indeed these same words are not found in two *Coptic* Manuscript Copies that are extant in the King's Library, nor in the *Arabic* which answers to this *Coptic*. The same Bishop Walton argues no better in the same place, when he proves (b) the antiquity of the *Arabic* Versions, and even of the *Syriac*, by the seventh verse of the fifth Chapter of the first Epistle of St. John, which is not found in these Translations, nor in the ancient *Greek* Manuscripts; this is (says he) a proof that they are of great antiquity, since this verse, which was not expressed in many *Greek* Copies before the Heresie of

(a) *Antiquissimam verò esse versionem colligere ex eo est, quod Matt. 6. 13. deest doxologia in Oratione Dominica, ut in Vulgata Latina, & in omnibus antiquis Græcis MSS. ut in collationibus nostris codicum Græcorum Novi Testamenti apparet. Nam Orationem illam desisse istis verbis, libera nos à malo, statuunt viri longè doctissimi. Walt. in Bibl. Polyg. Proleg. XIV.*

(b) *Utriusque verò antiquitas ex versiculi illius 1 Joann. 5. 7. absentia colligitur, qui in Syriaca, ut & vetustissimis Græcis exemplaribus, nostro Alexandrino, aliisque MSS. Græcis quos contulimus non reperitur. Quod sanè magnæ vetustatis argumentum est, cum post aamnatam Arii hæresim hic versiculus qui tunc id multis exemplaribus desiderabatur, in omnibus suppletus esse videtur. Walt. ibid.*

Arius, seems to have been supplied therein after the condemnation of this Heresie. The Arguments of this Protestant Author shew that he hath not read the *Greek Copies*, the various readings of which he hath inserted in the sixth Tome of his Polyglott Bible; for it is not possible, but that there must be several of them that have no great antiquity; and if he had consulted them, he would have seen that the verse now in dispute, is not found therein: It is so far from being supplied by the *Grecians* (as Bishop *Walton* affirms) in the most part of their Copies after the condemnation of the *Arian Heresie*, that it is in the most modern *Greek Manuscripts*. Moreover, the *Arabic Versions* mentioned by Bishop *Walton* in that place, being composed from the *Coptic* or *Syriac*, we ought to judge of the former onely with respect to the latter, otherwise it might be inferred that the *Arabic* translations are as ancient as the *Syriac* and *Coptic*, which conclusion would be altogether absurd.

Besides those *Arabic Versions* of the New Testament composed from the *Syriac* and *Coptic*, I believe that there are others, which have been immediately taken from the *Greek* by the *Melchites*, or Orthodox, that is to say, by those who follow the pure Doctrine of the *Greek Church*, without adhering to any of the Sects which are in the *Levant*. But notwithstanding the enquiry that I have made to find out the Copies of these *Melchites* written in *Greek* and *Arabic*, I could not discover any of them; nevertheless I judge that there must be some extant, by a *Lecti- onary* taken out of the Gospels, the Epistles of St. *Paul*, and the Psalms, which is in the Library of the University of *Leyden*, wherein the *Greek* is written on one side in large and fair *Greek Characters*, and the *Arabic* on the other: mention is made of this *Lecti- onary* in the Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the same Library, in which it is described in these words; *Series lectionum Græc. Arab. ex Evang. & Psalm. exemplar antiquissimum & octingentis forte, ut è Græco charactere colligebat Scaliger, abhinc annis scriptum.* *Heinsius* hath likewise cited it in his Exercitations, under the Title of a very ancient *Greek* and *Arabic* *Lecti- onary*, in *Lecti- onario Græco- Arabico antiquissimo*. He hath also remarked two passages wherein it differs from the ordinary *Greek*: And it cannot be attributed (in my opinion) to any other but the *Melchites*, who performed their Service in *Greek*. To be better informed concerning this Manuscript, I dispatched a Letter sometime ago to Mr. *Leers*, Bookseller of *Roter- dam*, for Mr. *Le Moine*, Professor of Divinity in the University of *Leyden*, who is a person very expert in the Oriental Languages.

Catal. Bibl.
publ. Lug-
dun. Bat.
an. 1674.
p. 281.
Dan. Hein.
Exer. Sac.
c. 15, & 16.

Mem. de
Mr. le
Moine
Theol. de
Leyde.

Here follows the Answer that I received from this Divine. " The *Greek* and *Arabic* *Lecti- onary* mentioned by Mr. *Simon*, is indeed in our Library: It is a very fair Manuscript; however, I do not believe that it is so ancient as it is declared to be in the Catalogue of the *Leyden* Library, and as *Heinsius* hath imagined. It is true that the *Greek* is written *uncialibus literis*, which is a mark of antiquity; but the *Arabic*, which is in one column and in the same page, appears to me to

" be

" be of a Version and Writing that is not so ancient. It is a Book in
 " large 8°. and hath passed through the fire, for I have found several
 " pages thereof burnt and sing'd; it hath no Title, and it cannot be
 " guess'd neither by the beginning nor by the end, when, for whom,
 " and where it was written, nor in whose possession it hath been. It is
 " not a Lectionary for the whole year; it begins at the Sunday called,
 " *Κυριακή τοῦ Βαίωv*, and ends at that of our Saviour's Resurrection, and
 " of his apparition in the midst of the Apostles, when he caused St. *Thomas*
 " to lay aside his incredulity: It is composed of diverse passages ta-
 " out of the Gospels, the Epistles, and the Psalms: It comes very near
 " the Lectionaries of the Greek Church; and I am apt to suspect that it
 " was used by some person of the Church of *Alexandria*, not by a *Ja-*
 " *cobite Coptic*, but by a *Melchite*, who, not well understanding the
 " Greek, read the *Arabic*, which was the vulgar tongue of the Coun-
 " trey.

This Memorial confirms what I had observed in the Note sent to
 Mr. *Leers*, to be communicated to Mr. *Le Moine*, viz. That the *Greek*
 and *Arabic* Lectionary, which is in the Library of *Leyden*, could not be
 copied out by a *Melchite*, according to the use of his Church, in the
 Public Services whereof the Sacred Books were read in the *Greek* tongue,
 which was no longer understood by the People. That which might
 deceive *Scaliger* and *Heinsius*, as concerning the antiquity of this Manu-
 script, is, that there are certain *Greek* Books written by the *Coptics*, which
 seem to be in those letters called *Unciales*, and which nevertheless are
 not very ancient. It cannot be easily conceived how the *Arabic* column
 could be added to the *Greek* any considerable time after. We must (as
 I apprehend this matter) argue with respect to the *Greek* and *Arabic*
 Copy after the same manner as touching the *Syriac* and *Arabic*, and the
Coptic and *Arabic*. When these People had disused their ancient Lan-
 guages, they composed Versions in their vulgar Tongues for their private
 use, preserving the old Translations in the public Service of their Church.
 This is the cause that the *Melchites*, who hold the same opinions as the
Grecians, have transcribed some of their Copies in two columns, one of
 which is *Arabic* and the other *Greek*. I have likewise found in the King's
 Library two Liturgies of this nature, in which the *Greek* is on one side,
 and the *Arabic* on the other; but those Liturgies, the first of which bears
 the name of St. *Basil*, and the second, that of *Gregory Nazianzene*, seem
 to me rather to have been written by some *Copte Jacobite* than by a *Mel-*
chite.

The first Edition of the Books of the New Testament in *Arabic* is In fol.
 that of *Rome*, wherein the four Gospels are printed in fair Characters, Romæ.
 with a *Latin* Version annexed thereto: There are also some Copies of an. 1591.
 this *Roman* Edition, in which the *Arabic* is onely inserted. In Typog.
 as there appears no Preface at the beginning of this Book, at least in se- Medic.
 veral Copies that I have seen, we cannot judge of the design of those
 who

as they shall think fit, nevertheless, I shall not be disturb'd by these Practices.

He endeavours to retaliate these Aspersions cast on him by the Jesuits, and even sufficiently insinuates in the Preface to his New Testament, That he Translated it only with a design to cause the Doctrine of Jesus Christ to be propagated among Christians. *I must declare, says he, That the principal reason that oblig'd me, above Ten Years ago, to undertake this Version, was the Ignorance of the Gospel, and the corruption of its Maxims, which I perceiv'd to be predominant in the mind of the Professors of Christianity.* He complains, that the most part of Christians, at this day, consult only modern Authors, who have introduced a sort of scepticism into Religion, whereby the Affirmative may be as easily maintained as the Negative.

Not that French Versions, of the New Testament, were then wanting ; but Mr. Godeau apparently believ'd, that his which was composed by a new Method, and even in more elegant French, than the preceding, would over-run all the other : Nevertheless, we do not find that it has obtain'd so great repute in the World ; and the Sale thereof was much obstructed by F. Amelote's Translation, and that of Mons, which were publish'd a little before it ; although the Gentlemen of Port-Royal, very much approv'd the Epistle and Preface, that we have even now mention'd ; for in regard that this Bishop maintain'd the same Opinions, with them, and was no Friend to the Jesuits, they fail'd not to oppose it to all those that attack'd their Version. *It is for the publick good (says one of their Apologists) that my Lord Bishop of Vence, hath (so successfully) taken pains, in confuting , with so great vigour and prudence, the Enemies of the Truth, who endeavour to take away, from the Sons of the Church, the Testament of their Father ; and who (after having continually disputed against this Divine Testament, with the sophistical ratiocinations of a corrupted Doctrine) go about to prevent those Laws, from being known, which they have so often violated.*

Ans^r. to the
2d. Let. of
a Prot. Div.
concern. the
Transl. of
Mons.

It cannot be denied that Mr. Godeau was mov'd by an extraordinary Piety, and had a very great desire of being serviceable to the Publick, but it may be doubted without doing any injury to his reputation, whether he were endued with all those qualifications that are requisite for the composing of a good Translation of the New Testament. And indeed we need not to search very far into his Work to find sufficient proof thereof ; for he is not exact even in the very first words of his Version. He renders these words, *Liber Generationis*, thus, *The Book of the Genealogy*. If he intended to express them literally, he ought to have translated, *The Book of the Generation* ; and in adhering only to the sense, they should be interpreted *The Genealogy*. But forasmuch as he has acknowledg'd himself not to be a Grammarian, it were needless to insist on these sort of niceties, whereof nevertheless they ought not to be ignorant, who undertake to Translate the Holy Scriptures.

We

We have reason to wish that there were a more clear connexion between the Text of his Version, and his Additions, or Explications. However, he assures us in his Preface, that *he has taken them all from the works of the Fathers, or from the most approv'd modern Commentaries*, and that he avouches nothing on his own authority; but this ought not to hinder him from rendering his Translation conformable to his Additions. He Translates for example, these words in Chap. 8. of St. John's Gospel, vers. 25. *principium qui & loquor vobis*, after this manner *I am the beginning* (of all things) *who speak unto you*; and adds afterward (*I am the same person that I said unto you from the beginning*). In this passage τὴν ἀρχὴν in the Accusative case, ought to be taken adverbially, and as if St. John had said ἐξ ἀρχῆς a principio. If this be true, he should not Translate in the Text of his Version, *I am the beginning*, &c. It were much more expedient to insert what he has added in the form of an explication, but since he has only collected that which he had read in different Commentaries, he is not always conformable to himself.

Besides that he does not follow the Vulgar in Chap. 1. of the Epistle to the Romans, vers. 4. neither hath he explain'd this passage according to the Letter in rendring it thus, *who was declared* (caus'd himself to be acknowledg'd as) *the Son of God by vertue*, (the power of his Miracles) *by the fulness of the Holy Ghost* (who dwelt in him, and which he gave to his Church) *and by his resurrection from the dead*. These words, *secundum spiritum sanctificationis*, do not literally signify *by the fulness of the Holy Ghost*.

In the 9th vers. of the same Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, he has Translated these words *cui servo in spiritu*, after this manner, *whom I serve in my spirit* (with an interior worship). If he had added nothing in different Characters to limit his interpretation, it would have been literal; for there is no mention made in this place of an *interior worship*; but simply of the Ministry of St. Paul, who was an Apostle of Jesus Christ. This same defect abounds in many other places of M. Godeau's Translation, who under colour of publishing an *explain'd Version* of the New Testament, has substituted the private explications of Commentators in the room of the words of the Holy Ghost.

It is true indeed that he generally marks this kind of illustrations in the Italick Letter, to distinguish them from his Text; however, this does not prevent the limitation of the sense, and the restraining of it sometimes to false Glosses, or at least to those that are very uncertain. As for instance, where it is related in Chap. 27. of St. Matth. vers. 45. that from Noon untill Three of the Clock, darkness was spread over the whole Earth, *tenebra factæ sunt super universam terram*, he adds by way of explication, *there was a general Eclipse of the Sun, which continued three hours, and happen'd the Moon being full, contrary to the*
course

course of Nature. But it is much more probable that this darkness was no where but in the Land of *Judea*, which is call'd according to the usual stile of the Scriptures, *the whole Earth*. Moreover we find no mention of any Eclipse in this place, much less of one that was general.

This Translator hath sometimes observ'd the various Readings of the *Greek Text*, but he has not always put them in *Italick*, as he was oblig'd to do, since he Translated the *Latin* of the *Vulgar*, and not the *Greek*: Thus he hath added in *Chap. 6.* of *St. Matth.* vers. 13. at the end of the *Lords Prayer* these words in the *Roman* letter, as the rest of the *Text*, *For thine is the Kingdom, and the Power and the Glory, for ever and ever.* Afterwards he makes this remark; *These words are express'd in the Greek Text, but not in the Version.*

This being granted, they ought to be printed in the *Italick*, and not in the *Roman* Character: But he apparently believ'd that they belong'd to the *Original*, and that therefore he ought not to retrench them, altho' they were not contain'd in the *Vulgar*. However, they that have attain'd to never so little skill in the Art of *Critick*, will be apt to determine that it is a *Gloss*, which hath been added afterward in the *Greek Text*. We have given a sufficient account of *M. Godeau's* explain'd Version, let us now proceed to examin the Translation of the *Port Royal*, which hath been so much talkt of in the World.

9
3
9

C H A P. XXXV.

Of the Version of the New Testament Printed at Mons. An Examination of the Second Part of the Preface, in which the Gentlemen of Port-Royal justify their Method.

IF we may give credit to the Writers of Apologies, on behalf of the Translation of the New Testament Printed at Mons: *This Work* Ab. & null. l'ord. de M. l' Arch. de Par. *hath obtain'd every where such Repute, that perhaps no Book that has been publish'd for many ages, ever met with greater applause.* And therefore it would seem to be a piece of rashness to refuse to subscribe to so universal an approbation: But forasmuch as able Criticks do not usually judge of Books according to the report that is spread abroad concerning them, and otherwise, in regard that the Gentlemen of Port-Royal cannot expect to be believ'd altogether on the testimony that they give of themselves, it is requisite to examine in particular, whether this approbation be well grounded or not.

We may observe that when *Martin Luther* in the last age published a Translation of the Bible in the *German* Tongue, it was forthwith highly esteem'd by the most part of the Northern People, and much admir'd by them, on the account of the clearness and elegancy of the expressions; nay, it is even at this day in great repute among the whole *Lutheran* party. But they who were expert in Critical Disquisitions, relating to the Sacred Books, soon perceiv'd that this Version did not deserve those extraordinary commendations that were every where bestowed on it, since the Author thereof has made use of a method which is subject to illusion.

Forasmuch as the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have follow'd the very same method in their Version of the New Testament, it has admitted almost the same defects as that of *Luther*. And indeed, if we compare the Reasons alledg'd by the Protestants of *Germany*, to justify their Patrons Bible, with the Vindications that these Gentlemen have Publish'd to maintain their Translation, there will appear so perfect a resemblance between them, that it might be justly believ'd, that the Authors of both those Works have proceeded on the very same Principles. To treat of every thing in its order, I shall hereafter discourse concerning *Luther's* Translation, when I shall come in due course to the examination of the *German* Versions.

I know that it has been objected to the Translators of *Mons*, that their Version confirms in many places the innovations of the Hereticks. But

in regard that I here profess to follow the ordinary Rules prescrib'd to me by the Critical Science, and not to act the part, either of a Divine, or a Decider of Controversies, it ought not to be expected that I should find out any Heresies in this Version. It may well happen that it is not exempt from Errors, to which those persons are usually obnoxious, who have engag'd themselves in any Sect or Party, and that the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have introduc'd the Holy Ghost, speaking according to their Prejudicate Notions. But I do not pretend to condemn them only on this account, that they seem to be suspected by many. To do them justice, it is necessary to examine their Work in particular. I shall begin with the Title of the Book, and the Second Part of their Preface, which may rather be taken for an Apology.

Printed at
Mons in
1667.

The Title of the Version of *Port-Royal* is express'd in these terms. *The New Testament of our Lord JESUS CHRIST Translated into French, according to the vulgar Edition; together with the variations of the Greek Text.* There is none that would not soon be apt to believe in reading this Title, that the Interpreter has really Translated the New Testament from the Vulgar Edition, and that he hath mark'd the places in which it differs from the *Greek*; nevertheless, we find that he follows the *Latin* for a while: At another time the *Greek*, and sometimes neither of them. It is true indeed, that he adheres much more to the Vulgar than to the *Greek*: But if the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* were exact, their Translation would have been conformable to the Title prefixed at the beginning thereof, and for this reason they ought not to abandon the *Latin* Interpreter in the Text of their Work. If they intended to observe the variations of the *Greek*, they ought to insert them in the Margin, or at the bottom of the pages; whereas they are found in divers places in the Text, whereof they even sometimes constitute a part, and the Vulgar is exhibited in some of those passages in the form of a Note. Moreover, can it be affirmed by them, that they have Translated the New Testament, *according to the Vulgar Edition, with the variations of the Greek Text.* Since they have produc'd very few of these variations of the *Greek*, and even those that are of the least importance? Let us proceed to the Preface.

They likewise give us to understand, that they were not ignorant of the Qualifications of a good Version of the Holy Scriptures, when they observe, that they who undertook to compose this Translation, understood that it was not sufficient to render Sense for Sense, but that the expressions must likewise be retain'd, by marking the proper Words, and by representing, (as much as is possible) their Energy, Extent, Order, Structure and Connexions.

This is indeed the *Idea* that ought to be form'd, whensoever we design to Translate the Sacred Books; and I do not believe that any person, endued with a sound Judgment, tho' of never so mean a capacity, can allow the Reasons which have induc'd the Translators of *Mons*, to depart

depart so far from this Method. They affirm, That In adhering after this manner to the Letter, the Sense was sometimes so obstructed, that it seem'd to be un-intelligible; and that, by endeavouring to exhibit an indeterminate and uncertain Sense, the Readers were frequently left void of all Sense: Lastly, That, by this means, the Majesty of the Holy Scriptures was infinitely debased, in retaining nothing of that Venerable, and altogether Divine Air which it had in the Original Languages.

But, in my Opinion, there is a certain Meen to be observ'd between these Interpreters; who, to adhere too strictly to the Letter, render themselves un-intelligible, and those that depart too far from it, as the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have done. If both these manners of Translating are defective, the first, which was follow'd by the most part of the *Jews*, and by the ancient *Latin* Interpreters, is much less dangerous than the second; and the defect of the first may be easily supplied by certain Illustrations: and when we are once accusom'd to this sort of Versions, the Holy Scriptures will become much more Intelligible; whereas we are apt, in following the second Method, to give out a Sense purely Human, which we afterwards cause to pass for the Word of God; and this is chiefly to be fear'd when the Translators are addicted to prejudicate Notions; for, under pretence of not having the Sense of a passage uncertain and indeterminate, they take the liberty to establish their own Opinions.

As for what is objected, That the first manner debases the Majesty of the Holy Scriptures; and that it preserves nothing of the Air which they had in the Original Tongues: I answer, That, on the contrary, in making use of the second Method, which departs from the expressions of the Original, nothing of this Air can be retain'd. It must be acknowledg'd, That the Gentleman of *Port-Royal* observe as much the Elegancy of the *French-Tongue*, in their Version of the *New-Testament*, as the *Lutherans* have done that of the *German* in their *High-Dutch-Bible*; but neither of them retain scarcely any thing of this Venerable and altogether Divine Air, that appears in the Holy Scriptures, in the Original Languages: And we do not find therein this simplicity of Style which is every where conspicuous throughout all the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles.

This is evident, even from the very first words of the Translation of *Mons*, where we read the *Genealogy* of *Jesus Christ*: and indeed these two *Latin* Words, *Liber Generationis*, which directly answer to two others expressed in the *Greek* Text of *St. Matthew*, signify the *Genealogy*; but an Interpreter, who is desirous to preserve this simple Air, which is peculiar to the Sacred Books in their Original Tongues, will chuse rather to Translate simply, the *Book of the Generation*; and, at the same time, to give notice in the Margent, That, in the Style of the Bible, that which was understood among the *Grecians*, by the term, γενεαλογία a *Genealogy*, is call'd βιβλος γενεας, A *Book of the Generation*; and that the Apostles

took this Expression from the *Greek* Version of the *Septuagint*, who have thus interpreted the *Sepher Foldoch* of the *Hebrews*. We shall, thro' this means, by little and little, be acquainted with the Style of the Holy Scriptures, wherein all manner of Discourses, whether large or short, are call'd by the name of a *Book*.

These Gentlemen endeavor afterward to justify their Method by the example of *St. Jerom*, who is, as it were, the Model of Translators of the Holy Scriptures, since the Church hath so solemnly approv'd his Version. Now, this learned Father (say they) did not believe, That he was oblig'd servilely to adhere to the Letter, as appears from his manner of Translating the Books of *Job*, and the Prophets. But if *St. Jerom's* Method were to be observ'd by the Interpreters of the Bible, they ought not to make use of his Version of the Writings of *Job* and the Prophets, which are very obscure Books, and of an extremely concise Style in the *Hebrew*. It were more expedient to follow the Ancient Version of the *New Testament*, corrected by him, which is very far from the Translation of *Mons.*

Furthermore, It ought to be considered, That that which has caus'd so great Authority to be attributed to *St. Jerom's* Version, is the general approbation of the *Western* Churches successively for many Ages; but this approbation cannot serve as a Rule to the Modern Translators, who are not allow'd to take too much liberty, under pretence of certain passages of the Bible, which this learned Father has Translated, rather according to the sense than literally. This imitation (which may be attended with very ill Consequences) is to be avoided as culpable, especially at a time when the whole Christian World is divided into different Sects; who all endeavour to confirm their Opinions by Scripture, without having any regard to Tradition.

But, after all, Can the Translators of *Port-Royal* be compar'd to *St. Jerom*, who perfectly understood the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin* Tongues? It is far more requisite in a Translation of the Sacred Books in the Vulgar Tongue, to adhere to the Letter as much as is possible, than to exhibit a too remote or distorted Sense by abandoning it; nevertheless, such care might be taken as to prevent these Translations from being intricate and un-intelligible, as those of the *Jews* most frequently are.

I cannot apprehend to what purpose these Translators do here insist on the example of *St. Augustin*, who (say they) has cited the words of *St. Jerom's* Version, even when it was not as yet in use among the Churches, to shew the Splendor and Majesty of the Holy Scriptures. It is sufficiently known how vigorously the new Translation of *St. Jerom* was opposed by this Pious Bishop, who could never be perswaded to approve it; neither is the Testimony of the same *St. Augustin*, afterwards alledg'd by the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, to justify the method that they pretend to have observ'd in their Version, more opportunely urg'd. They produce his Remark on the several Translations that were extant in his Time; He therein affirms, That this great number of Versions might be more service-

serviceable than prejudicial to the understanding of the Holy Scriptures : and, forasmuch as some of them adhere to the Letter, and others to the Sense, he determines, That all ought to be consulted ; nevertheless, after such a manner as the Ancient Version, call'd the *Italick*, should be chiefly prefer'd.

Nothing could be alledg'd, that is more contrary to the assertions of the Translators of *Port-Royal*, than this reflection of *St. Augustin*. To be convinc'd thereof, we need only to compare the Psalter of this *Italick* Translation, as yet remaining in our Possession, with that of *Mons*, which is now in dispute, and we shall find no resemblance to balance between them. That of *Mons* departs almost every where from the Letter, and is rather an explain'd or paraphrastical, than a simple Version ; whereas the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, on the contrary, follows the Letter throughout his whole Work, and adheres to the words of his Text, which renders it somewhat obscure, especially to those who are not well vers'd in the reading of the Sacred Books.

I should not disapprove the Remark made by them in the same place, concerning certain words which they have Inserted in their Translation in the *Italick* Character, if it were true, that they had added them only to express the Sense more clearly, or even to render their Version more conformable to the propriety of the *French-Tongue* ; nevertheless, without diminishing any thing of its exactness, and without departing from the Letter. But if we only cast an Eye on this Translation, we shall soon observe a great number of these Additions in the *Italick* Letter, that are not applied to their proper use, and which even sometimes alter or weaken the sense of the Original. What necessity was there, for example, to translate in the beginning of the Gospel according to *St. Matthew*, Chap. 1. ver. 6. *David qui fut Roy, David who was King*, making *qui fut, who was*, in *Italick*, as being added ? It were more expedient, in my opinion, simply to Interpret *le Roy David, David the King*, which perfectly expressed the *Greek* and *Latin*, and we thereby at the same time render the Article *Téu* which is also included in the Original.

Moreover, they have translated, in vers. 20. of the same Chapter, *a. esté formé du St. Esprit, was formed of the Holy Ghost* ; the word *formed* is Printed in *Italick*, as an Addition ; and it is intimated at the bottom of the Page, that we read according to the Letter, *est du St. Esprit, is of the Holy Ghost*. I am apt to believe, That it is much more convenient to place that in the Text of the Version, which is found in the bottom of the Page, and to transfer that to the Note which is express'd in the Translation. In Chap. 2. of *St. Matthew*, vers. 16. we read in this Version, *ayant envoyé des gens armés, il fit tuer, having sent Soldiers, he caus'd to be Slain* ; and these words, *des gens armés, Soldiers*, are markt in the *Italick* Character, as being an Addition. But, might it not be rendred more simply, *envoya tuer, he sent to Slay*, as Father *Arnelote* has done ?

These things, indeed, are but of very little moment, and they are pro-
pounded

pounded only to represent the *Idea* of an accurate Version of the Bible, and to shew at the same time that the Translators of *Mons* are not altogether exact. In the sequel of this Discourse we shall produce other more important examples, whereby it will appear that these Gentlemen under colour of causing the Evangelists and Apostles to speak more clearly, by adding to their Text certain words in the *Italick* Letter, have introduc'd them, uttering such things as they never so much as imagin'd.

We may perceive in this Version, another defect not very remote from the former, which they have endeavour'd to justify in their Preface: Instead of simply Translating the words of the Text, they explain them in the body of their Version, as if the Notes were not appropriated to this sort of explication. As for instance, we read in the Vulgar conformably to the *Greek* Original, in chap. 1. of *Luke*, ver. 5. *fuit sacerdos quidam nomine Zacharias de vice Abia*, which words are thus Translated in the Version of *Mons*, *Il y avoit un Prêtre nommé Zacharie de la famille d'Abia, l'une des familles Sacerdotales qui servoient dans le Temple chacune en leur rang*: There was a Priest named Zachary of the family of Abia, one of the Sacerdotal, that serv'd in the Temple every one in their order.

This is plainly to insert the Commentary in the Translation, for we find only in the Text, *There was a Priest named Zacharias, of the rank or course of Abia*; neither is there any thing therein, that is *indeterminate and uncertain*. It is sufficient in a Translation clearly to express the Grammatical or Literal sense, there being no necessity to intermix with this Version all the illustrations that may be annexed to it in certain particular remarks, or in a Commentary. If it were requisite to explain what is meant by *this rank of Abia*, who was a Priest, this might be conveniently done in a separated Note.

But there is in this place (say they) in the *Latin*, as also in the *Greek*, a peculiar word containing certain *Ideas* that cannot be express'd in *French*, but by divers words, I answer, that these *French* words *du rang d'Abia, of the rank of Abia*, are extremely conformable to the *Latin de vice Abia*. That which has mislead the Translators of *Mons*, is, that they have imagin'd, that certain illustrations ought to be inserted in a Version in those passages wherein there is any obscurity: But in case they intended to observe this method, they ought not to attribute to their Work the simple name of a *Version*; but that of an *explain'd or paraphrastical Version*, as Mr. Godeau has call'd his Translation of the New Testament. We scarcely see any Books in which there are not contain'd certain terms, either of Art, or relating to peculiar Customs, or Manners, that are not generally known throughout the whole World: It is not expedient on this account, when we Translate them to explain these terms in the Text of our Version, to facilitate the understanding of them; much less ought this to be done with respect to the sacred Books, because there are some places in which this sort of Explication would be dangerous, especially when the Translators are not judicious, or maintain peculiar opinions.

Their

Their defect may well be imputed to *Luther*, for having assumed too much liberty in his Translation of the Bible, and it is very difficult not to attribute the same Errors to the Translators of *Port-Royal*, after the perusal of their Version of the New Testament.

Another defect in this Version, is, the inserting of certain expressions in the Text, which are not Literal, and the transferring at the same time those that are Literal to the Margent; to the end (say they) that we may not be depriv'd of the simple Interpretation of the Letter, and that we may judge (according to St. *Augustin's* phrase) of the liberty that has been taken in not exactly following it. But if we reflect a little on a considerable part of that which the Translators of *Mons* have plac'd in the Margent with the Letter (*l*) as being the mark of the Literal Sense, we shall be convinc'd that this ought to be in the Text, and that on the contrary, that which is found in the Text ought to be in the Margent. I do not apprehend how this method can be call'd an exactness, which seem'd to be necessary for the testifying of that respect which is due unto the Letter. If this happen'd only in those passages where the Letter includes harsh and barbarous Phrases, or certain *Hebraisms* too remote from our manner of speaking, I should have nothing to object against it; but the present debate is concerning literal and clear expressions, that are referr'd to the Margent, for the admission of others into the Text, that rather partake of the nature of an Explication, than of that of a Version.

Neither do I conceive to what purpose the testimony of St. *Augustin* is here alledg'd, since this Father (as hath been already observ'd) preferr'd the *Italick*, which very much adher'd to the Letter, before all other Versions. Can his Commendation of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter in these words: *Maluit pius interpret minus, Latine aliquid dicere quam minus proprie*, be applied to the Translators of *Port Royal*? These Gentlemen are accusom'd to cite St. *Augustin*, that they introduce him into all their discourses without much consideration. Aug. in Psal. 50.

I shall leave it to the judgment of those who have perus'd the Translation of *Mons*, whether it be true with respect to the style, that they have taken care to retain (as much as is possible) the air and character of that of the Holy Scripture; and that in regard that the style of the Gospel is extremely simple, they have endeavour'd to represent this admirable simplicity, by avoiding those tropes and manners of speaking, that have any savour of human Eloquence. If this were their design in Translating the New Testament; why have they affected to substitute select Phrases, and abundance of insignificant words, in the room of simple and vulgar expressions that were us'd by the Evangelists and Apostles. To what purpose have they banish'd from this Version divers words which a continual use hath authorized, and that have been, as it were, Canoniz'd in the Western Churches?

The Word *Scribe*, for instance, which is often found in the New Testament, is always express'd in this Version by that of *Doctor of the Law*. The reason of this alteration alledg'd by these Gentlemen in their Preface,

is, That the word *Scribe* in our *Tongue* is taken in a notion altogether different from that of *Scriba* in the *Gospel*, signifying only a *Writer* or *Transcriber*; as if the word *γραμματος* in *Greek*, and that of *Scriba* in *Latin*, were not as much equivocal in these two *Languages*, as that of *Scribe* in *French*. According to this way of arguing, we must also condemn the *Evangelists* for appropriating the *γραμματος* to signify a *Doctor* of the *Law*, since they might have made use of other terms that were more clear.

But they were not altogether so nice as the *Gentlemen* of *Port-Royal*; they followed in this and many other places the ancient *Greek Bible*, wherein they read the word *γραμματος*: And the *Latin Interpreter* of the *New Testament* adhering to the *Letter* of the *Greek Original*, hath Translated it by that of *Scriba*. This word is so well known in the *French Tongue* that there is none that does not understand the meaning thereof, when it is pronounc'd *Scribe* in our *Churches*, and that it is found in all the *Versions* in the *Vulgar Languages*; the *Italians* have render'd it by *Scribi*, and the *Spaniards* by *Escribas*. *Diodati* who has Translated in *Chap. 2. of St. Matth. vers. 4. gli Scribi del popolo, the Scribes of the people*, explains in a *Note* the word *Scribi* by these; *Letterati, Dottori & Maestri in Scrittura*, that is to say, *Learned Men, Doctors and Masters in Writings*. *Castalio* who affects their too great a niceness to change in his *Version* the most part of those words that are usually call'd *Consecrated*, has nevertheless retain'd this.

It is likewise an effect of the nicety of the *Translators* of *Mons*, that instead of the word *Gehenna*, they have inserted that of *Enfer, Hell*. *Gehenna* (say they) is translated *Enfer*, and not *Geenne* or *Gène*, because the word *Gène* signifies at present a different thing in our *Language* from that of *Gehenna* in the *Gospel*, which is certainly taken there for the place where the damn'd are tormented, call'd by us *enfer Hell*. But if there be a necessity of changing all the words that may be interpreted in a different sense in the *New Testament*, their would remain many more alterations to be made in the *Version* of *Mons*.

The *Evangelists* had the *Greek* word *Ἅδης*, which they frequently applied after the *Septuagint*, to signify *Hell*; but forasmuch as that of *Gehenna*, which is *Heker* or *Chaldaick*, was very much us'd in their time, although it were invented by the *Rabbins*, in the sense that is here ascrib'd to it, they chose rather to make use thereof, than of *Ἅδης*, which was *Greek*. The ancient *Latin Interpreter* hath carefully preferr'd it, *Erasmus*, *Beza*, and even *Castalio* here likewise retain'd it; Lastly it is inserted by *Diodati* in his *Italian Version* *Geenna*, together with this *Note* in the *Margent*: *questa parola s'usa per le pene dell' inferno; this word is taken to signify the torments of Hell*.

Could not the *Gentlemen* of *Port-Royal* take away by a like *Note*, the ambiguity which is (in their opinion) apparent in the *French Tongue* in the word *Gène*? They thought fit rather to place the word *Enfer* in that *Text* of their *Translation*, and that of *Gène* in their *Note*. The

Ministers

Ministers of *Geneva*, who were not ignorant that the Word *Gebenne* signified otherwise in *French* than *Gebenne* in the Gospel, forbore not to preserve it in their Version. *Calvin*, *Beza*, and many other Divines, who have often revis'd this Translation, and have principally applied themselves to the retrenching of those words, that seem'd not to them to be pure *French*, have not omitted this; they were content only to describe in the Margent, its Original and Signification.

Moreover, they have not written *Gesne*, as the Translators of *Mons*, but *Gebenne*, to intimate the derivation thereof, which is *Hebrew*. It is Printed after this manner in the *French Bible* of *Antwerp*, which preceded that of *Olivitan*. And indeed there will be no ambiguity in this word. If we write *Gebenne* or *Geenne*, as it is found in the *Greek Text* of the New Testament. We should likewise at the same time explain its meaning, as *Diodeti*, and the other Ministers of *Geneva* have done in their Versions.

I do not believe that any judicious person will approve another Remark which the same Translators add in their Preface, when they affirm that it is not to depart from the Letter, to make use of divers words to express a single one. I durst avouch on the contrary, that an Interpreter who designs to represent the Character of the Author, whose Works he Translates ought not to alter his Version by using synonymous words; for if he be desirous to explain some of them, by others that are more clear and more known, they must not be inserted in the Text of the Version, but in the Margent, as several Translators of these latter times have done.

By this means we return the simple style of the Evangelists and Apostles, and even their words, as much as is possible, without rendring ourselves unintelligible; whereas the Translation of *Mons*, which is full of Synonymous words and Phrases, does not exhibit to us the genuine Style of the New Testament. When it happens (say these Gentlemen in their Preface) That two words are precisely substituted instead of one, because one of the two does not sufficiently express it, we have joyn'd these two words together by an *And*, in *Italick*, or by a *Not*, when the phrase is Negative, to shew that there is but one word in the Original. But besides that, they have surrogated two words in the room of one, in divers places, where there is no *And* in *Italick*; they sometimes limit or weaken the Sense of the Original, by this Second explicative word; and then it becomes no longer the Sacred Text, but a certain Interpretation thereof, concerning which, all Men are not agreed.

They produce as an example of these two words, inserted in the place of one, this passage, of *Chap. 5. of St. Mark, vers. 29. Si oculus tuus dexter scandalizat*; which they have Translated thus; *Si vone œil droit vous est vous est un sujet de scandele & de chute*: If your right Eye be unto you an occasion of scandal, and of falling. They affirm that the word *Scandal* alone, usually admits another Idea, and that it is taken for that which offends us, and not for that which causeth us to fall. But *St. Jerom*,

who ~~may~~ pretend to imitate, was not so nice: He hath Translated in many places of his Version, of the Old Testament, the Hebrew word (שְׂדָה) which signifies *laqueus*, by that of *Scandalum*.

However, we do not take it ill, that they have explain'd the word *Scandal*, by that of *Falling*, but this explication ought to be plac'd in the Margent, rather than in the Text of the Version. Is it not more expedient for example, to render those words of our Vulgar, in *Chap. 24. of St. Matthew, vers. 10. Scandalizabuntur multi* thus: *Plusieurs seront scandalisez ; many shall be Scandaliz'd*, then according to the Version of *Mons, Plusieurs trouveront des occasions de scandale & de chute. Many shall take an occasion of scandal and of falling?* They have subjoyn'd the former Interpretation, which is simple and natural at the bottom of the page; intimating that this is the literal Sense: They likewise observe the same method in many other places, as if the word *Scandalizeth* to *Scandalize*, were not pure *French*, or that being equivocal, it was necessary to make use of a *Periphrasis* to express it.

But the word *Scandalizo* is no less offensive in *Latin*, than *Scandalizer* in *French* and it is sufficient, that we have been for a long time accusom'd to it: therefore the Learned Dr. *John Boys* could not allow the practise of *Erasmus*, *Beza* and divers other Modern Translators, who have chang'd it, especially that of *Beza*, whom the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have imitated in this place, and in many others. This Minister, instead of those words of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, in *chap. 5. of St. Matth. vers. 29. quod si oculus tuus dexter scandalizat te*, which exactly answer to the *Greek*, has substituted these; *quod si oculus tuus dexter facit ut tu offendas*, *Cassiodorus*, *Keyna*, and *Cyprian de Valera* have likewise Translated in *Spanish* in imitation of *Beza*, *fuere occasion de caer*, that is to say, as it is express'd in the Version of *Mons, is an occasion unto you of falling*. It is true indeed, that these Gentlemen annex the word *Scandal* to that of *Falling*, and that this last is the explication of the former.

The above-cited Canon of *Ely* hath judiciously observ'd in his Remark on this passage of *St. Matthew*, (a) that the Verb *Scandalizat*, which is written in the ancient *Latin* Edition, being very well known among Christians, ought not to be taken away to place another in its room, altho' it may sound somewhat harsh in the Ears of some persons that are too nice. He adviseth only to transfer that to the Margent, which has been inserted by these Modern Interpreters in their Version. We might apply to the Translators of *Mons*, several apposite Rules of the Critical Art, that have been above exhibited; in which, this Learned Prote-

(a) Vetus scandalizet te, verbo hoc sensu notissimo Christianis. Idcirco loco suo moveri nolum, etsi minus fortasse satisfecerit auribus delicatioribus. Que hujus loco ab aliis perripuntur interpretibus sedem sibi querant in margine. Joann. Boys, Collat. vet. Interp. cum rec. ad c. 5. Matth. vers. 29.

stant condemns the Translation of *Beza*, as being too remote from the Vulgar.

We shall here mention another defect of the Version of *Mons*, which is very considerable, under colour of leaving no Sense uncertain and indeterminate, by reason that the *French* Tongue does not admit any dubious Expressions, they have frequently departed from the intention of the Evangelists and Apostles. These Translators endeavour to excuse themselves in their Preface, by alledging the example of the ancient Versions, that have been approv'd throughout the Catholick Church. *It is apparent (say they) that the Sense of the Hebrew Original is often determin'd and retrench'd in the Greek and Latin Versions of the Old Testament, and that in the Latin Translation of the New Testament many other significations are omitted, whereof the Greek Original is capable.* However, it is not lawful for Modern Interpreters to take too much liberty in their Versions on this account; neither does it appear that the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* are endued with sufficient skill, every where to make choice of the best Sense.

It is not sufficient, that they tell us, *That it is without doubt much more advantageous to the ignorant People, for whose use these Versions are more especially design'd, to meet with such a Sense as they are capable of understanding, than only to find a sort of confused Expressions, whereof they can comprehend nothing at all.* For it is to be fear'd, lest under this pretence, they should exhibit to us a New Testament, different from that of the Apostles and Evangelists.

They had reason to endeavour to prevent this ill consequence, by adding in the margin, at least in the most important places, the other Significations that might be attributed to the words of the Text: But forasmuch as they have sometimes follow'd the explications of the Fathers and other Commentators, which are not always Literal, it cannot be affirm'd, That they have altogether avoided those inconveniencies that were foreseen by them; neither does it appear, that they have sufficiently consider'd the Text of the Sacred Books, since their Learning consists chiefly in the reading of Commentaries, of which also they have not made an exact choice. However, a judicious Translator ought to express in his Version, the very words of his Original, as much as is possible to be done, without rendring himself un-intelligible.

I am apt to believe, That in Translating the Writings of *St. Paul*, they have taken a great deal of care in consulting all that has been produc'd on this subject, by the Fathers who have explain'd them; as also the Works of the most excellent Interpreters among our Modern Authors: But as for the Fathers, it is well known, that they have preferr'd *St. Augustin* before all others; and that with respect to the latter Commentators, they have been retain'd on the side of *Estius*; nevertheless, all People do not agree with them, that *St. Augustin* is the most clear-sighted of all the Fathers, especially in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.

tures. And altho' *Estius* be a very able Divine, and shews much profound Learning in his Commentaries on the Epistles of *St. Paul*, yet he is full of certain particular notions, which he frequently propounds to himself as a general Rule.

Lastly, The Translators of *Port-Royal* declare, that they found not a little difficulty in determining, whether they ought to follow the Vulgar Translation or the Greek Text. Not that they were ignorant (say they) of the authority which the Council of Trent hath ascrib'd to the Latin Version, by pronouncing it to be authentick, and that they did not apprehend, that in the most part of those places where it appears to be different from the ordinary Greek Text, it is confirm'd by very ancient Greek Manuscripts. But they knew likewise, that the Greek Text, such as it is now extant in the Vulgar Editions, is frequently authoriz'd in divers passages where it differs from the Latin Version, both by the consent of many of the Fathers, that have made use of them, and by a great number of Roman Catholics who maintain (as is acknowledg'd, even by Cardinal *PALLAVICINO*) That the Council of Trent, in declaring the ancient Latin Version to be authentick, intended only to avouch, That it contain'd nothing contrary to the Faith; but that they in no wise undertook to oblige all People to prefer it before the Greek Text, or to hinder any one from having recourse to it on several occasions.

It is to be admir'd, That the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, who have Translated the New-Testament for the use of the Ignorant People, as they themselves affirm, should find any difficulty in determining whether they ought to adhere to the Vulgar or to the Greek Text. Doth not even common Sense require, that they should deliver into the hands of the People, a Version of the Holy Scriptures, as they are read in their Church, according to the practice of all the Churches in the World? When the *Syrians* and *Copties* Translated the Bible into *Arabick* for the Instruction of their People, they did not deliberate, whether they should compose their New Translations from the Originals, or from their ancient Versions. The *Syrians* render'd their *Syriack* Version into *Arabick*, and the *Copties* their *Coptick* Translations into the same Language.

The matter in debate is not to know whether the Greek Text ought to be esteem'd beyond the Vulgar, or on the contrary; for whatsoever Sentiments we may have thereupon, we ought to exhibit to the People the Bible, as it is us'd in their Church; and this hath been observ'd by the most learned and judicious Persons of the Roman Catholick Communion; we need only to inspect the *German*, *English*, *Polish*, *Italian*, *Spanish*, and *French* Versions, composed by the Catholics: They have all follow'd the Vulgar, excepting the *Italian* of *Brucoli*, and the *French* of *Monsieur de Marolles*. *Brucoli* discourseth like a *Protestant* in the Prefaces to his Bible; and as for the Abbot *de Vitteloin*, he is much Inferior to the *Louvain* Divines, who never deliberated which of these two Methods ought to be observed by them, when they published a *French* Version of the whole Bible.

And

And indeed, none but the *Protestants* ever undertook to translate the Holy Scriptures into the Vulgar Tongue, from the Originals; who, in regard that they separated themselves from the Church of *Rome*, in which they were Educated, have likewise determined, that they were obliged to depart from their ancient Version; but all those proceedings shew, that they used too much precipitation in this matter. Therefore, It is not the simple Authority of the Council of *Trent*, that causeth us to prefer the Vulgar before all other Versions, but an un-interrupted Custom received above a Thousand Years ago, in the Western Churches; and the Bishops of this Council chiefly relied on this continual custom in declaring the Vulgar to be Authentick.

It is yet more surprizing, That the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* should acknowledge, that the Vulgar is authorized by several very ancient Manuscripts, in the greatest part of the passages where it appears to be different from the ordinary *Greek* Text; and that, notwithstanding this Remark, they should intimate in a great number of places of their Version, where this Translation is conformable to these ancient *Greek* Manuscripts, that it differs from the *Greek*; as if there never had been extant any other *Greek* Text than that which is found in the common Editions.

I confess, that having perceived so great a defect in the Translation of *Mons*, I was immediately induced to believe, that it was made by some Student of *Port-Royal*, who had perused no other Original than the *Geneva* Version, or that of *Beza*, or even some other taken from the *Greek*, and who had annexed to this certain Commentaries. Indeed we find in this Version the marks of so great weakness (as will afterwards be evident) that it is difficult for any one that has never so little a knowledge of this matter, to judge otherwise thereof. The Translators of *Mons* seem to have endeavoured in their Preface to prevent the Objection that I have even now made, but they discover a notable inconvenience which it will be impossible to remove, but by casting their Work entirely into a new Model.

For, to what purpose do they affirm, *That the Greek Text, such as it is now extant in the vulgar Editions is frequently authorized in divers passages, where it differs from the Latin Version, by the consent of many of the Fathers?* Although this were true, does it follow from thence, that the name of *Greek* Text ought only to be attributed to that which is included in the ordinary Editions? Nevertheless, the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have done this in their Translation, as if the *Greek* Manuscript to which the Vulgar is conformable, were to be esteemed as nothing; doth it not appear on the contrary, that this old Edition, being set forth in the Primitive Ages of the Church, could not follow any Copies but such as were extremely ancient? I do not avouch, that these very ancient *MSS.* ought always to be preferred before the others; for the contrary has been prov'd in the first part of this History: But I maintain, that the Translators of *Mons* have exhibited a very bad *Idea* of the Vulgar,

gar, in asserting in their Version, without any restriction, that it varied from the *Greek* in many places, when it exactly agreed with the *Greek* Text that was extant at the time when it was compos'd.

Moreover, I am willing to admit, with the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, that a considerable number of *Roman* Catholick Divines are of Opinion, that the Council of *Trent*, in pronouncing the *Vulgar* to be Authentick, did not undertake to oblige all People to prefer it before the *Greek* Text, or to hinder any one from having recourse to it on several occasions. Doth this prove, that we ought to abandon this ancient Edition, to adhere unto the *Greek* Text, whensoever we design to deliver a Version of the Holy Scriptures into the heads of the People? These People do not stand in need of knowing the various readings in the Originals of the Bible; it is sufficient, that they understand that which is in use in their Church. The *Syrians* and the *Copties* were not ignorant, that their Versions of the New-Testament were taken from the *Greek*; and that this *Greek*, as being the Original, is more exact in some places, and consequently that recourse may lawfully be had unto it; nevertheless, they forbore not to compose their *Arabick* Translations from their ancient Versions. If we are desirous to consult the *Greek* Text, it ought to be done in the Notes, that serve as an Illustration, according to the practice of the most able Commentators. We should have nothing to object against the Version of *Mons*, on this account, if this Method had been observ'd, which is consonant to the Sentiments of the Catholick Divines, who are cited by the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, as favourable to their undertaking.

However, they believe, that they have devis'd an expedient, which may in some sort unite the *Vulgar* Translation, and the *Greek* Text, and that may cause both to be found in this Version. But whatsoever expedient they may imagine, it will never be approv'd by any Judicious Persons: For there are but two Methods to be chosen, either to Translate entirely from the *Greek*, as *Erasmus*, *Pagninus*, and many others have done in their *Latin* Versions, and as it is likewise practis'd by the *Protestants* in their Translations in the Mother-Tongue, or to Translate altogether from the *Vulgar* Edition, according to the manner of the *Roman* Catholick Interpreters.

Let us, nevertheless, take a view of their method; According to this design (say they) we have render'd the *Vulgar* Translation in the Text, because it is more in use in the Church (they ought rather to say, because it is alone in use in the Church of *Rome*, which is the matter in debate) If it happen to contain any thing that is not express'd in the *Greek*, we include it between two Crochets, with the Letter [V] which signifies, that these words are found only in the *Vulgar*: on the contrary, if there be any thing in the *Greek*, which is not likewise compris'd in the *Vulgar* Translation, we add it in the Text, together with this mark [G], whereby it is intimated, That the words included between these two Crochets are not read in the *Greek*. And in those places where the *Greek* Text is different from the *Vulgar*, we insert the Interpretation
of

of the Greek in the Margent, and that of the Vulgar in the Text, excepting only in some very few places, where it is acknowledg'd by the Learned, That the Greek is to be preferr'd before the Latin; and then we place the Translation of the Greek in the Text, and that of the Vulgar in the Margent.

This pretended expedient is a manifest proof, That the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* had not a true *Idea* of the measures that are requisite to be taken in Translating the Sacred Books: For first, since their design was to deliver to the People the Vulgar Translation, as they have declar'd in the Title of their Work, they ought always to represent it in the Text of their Version. The present affair is not to enquire, whether the Vulgar be always exact or not, but simply to Translate it: and forasmuch as they propos'd to exhibit it as the Text, it was not necessary to include any passages thereof between two Crochets, with the Letter [V].

Moreover, It is an evident untruth to affirm, That the words which are comprehended within these two Crochets, are only found in the Vulgar; it being certain, that the greatest part of them are likewise extant in the *Greek*; since they were written in the *Greek* Text, that was us'd by the ancient *Latin* Interpreter. The same thing may be averr'd, concerning the words contain'd within two Crochets, with the Letter [G], which are said to be read only in the *Greek*; for they oftentimes happen only to be express'd in some *Greek* Copies, and not in all, since they are not found in the ancient *Greek* MSS. from which the *Latin* Version was compos'd.

Again, It is not true to avouch, That they have annexed the Translation of the *Greek* in the Margent, in the places where the *Greek* Text differs from the Vulgar; for there is no difference in a great part of those places, between the Vulgar Translation and the *Greek* from which it was taken. As for the passages where they have plac'd the Interpretation of the *Greek* in the Text, and that of the Vulgar in the Margent, many more objections might be made against it. Altho' we should even grant, That it is confess'd by some Learned Men, That the *Greek* might well be esteem'd beyond the *Latin* in those places; nevertheless, it ought not, for that reason, to be Inserted in the Text of the Version; the natural place thereof being among the separated Annotations, where we may take liberty freely to declare our judgment concerning the variations of the *Greek* from the *Latin*. It were requisite to illustrate all these Observations by some Examples.